FORUM

Vol. CIV, No. 1 and Column Review

RECEIVED
MAY 18 1946
SAN MATEO COUNTY
FREE LIBRARY

OUTCASTS: RUSSIA AND GERMANY
Frederick H. Cramer

IS IT TOO LATE TO STOP INFLATION?
Colston E. Warne

A NATION OF EIGHTH-GRADE SIRES
Paul H. Landis

SOUTH AMERICAN POWER POLITICS
Harry B. Murkland

FORUM: WHO CONTROLS OUR DELEGATE TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL? (With Documentary References)

THE THEATRE ARTS
John Gassner

POETRY
David Morton

BOOKS IN BRIEF
Jasper R. Lewis

HIGHLIGHTING THE NEWS

COLUMNS BY
Anne O'Hare McCormick
Samuel Grafton
Tom Daly

—And other articles and columns

25c a copy SEPTEMBER 1945 $3 a year

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM

SEPTEMBER, 1945

Volume CIV Number

A Nation of Eighth-Grade Sires ..... Paul H. Landis
The Role of Unions in Reconversion ..... Mark Starr
Is It Too Late to Stop Inflation? ..... Colston W. Warne
Why Attlee? ..... Morley G. Dilke
South American Power Politics ..... Harry B. Murkland
Outcasts: Russia and Japan ..... Frederick H. Cramer
Wood and the World ..... John Macquire
The Atomic Bomb ..... Hanson W. Baldwin
Education or Book Burning ..... Dorothy Thompson
Life on Loo-Choo ..... Malcolm W. Bingay
Who Will Put the Pieces Together? ..... Anne O'Hare McCormick
Highlighting the News .....
Getting Ahead of Ourselves ..... Paul Jones
Danger Ahead in France ..... Marquis W. Childs
Canada Takes the Middle Road ..... William Henry Chamberlain
Picture of the USA ..... George W. Benson
The Lowdown on the "Stoop Market" ..... Sgt. Henry McLemore
Petain—Victim of Reminisence ..... Samuel Grafton
The Trend to the Left ..... W. K. Kelsey
Poems ..... David Morton
The Theatre Arts ..... John Gassner
Books in Brief ..... Jasper R. Lewis
Forum: Who Shall Control Our Delegate to the Security Council? ..... M. K. Strong and A. B. McGinty
Listening In ..... H. C. L. Jackson

IN THIS ISSUE

With this issue, FORUM is again published as an independent magazin Under the accurate and informed editorship that has long made CURREN HISTORY a by-word for researchers and students, the new FORUM, like t old, will present the conflicts of interest, the varying viewpoints, of all the grou that make up our complex society. The old FORUM was widely read and muc respected: the new FORUM will follow its independent liberal policy.

College professors and educators, newspapers of every faction, outstandi columnists of national reputation—all these sources will be used to make the ne FORUM a unique magazine of *opinion*—opinion with the same accurate bac ground that has made CURRENT HISTORY so valuable for reference. In add tion to the regular articles the FORUM staff will read a mass of current materi each month and from it reprint articles, condense articles and independentl write articles—in all cases giving either a balanced picture or a special intere case which is frankly just that.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

051 F

FORUM

and Column Review

Vol. CIV SEPTEMBER, 1945 No. 1

A Nation of Eighth-Grade Sires

By Paul H. Landis

Dean of the Graduate School and Chairman of the Division of Rural Sociology
The State College of Washington

● The number of children born to American wives has declined from an average of eight or nine for women living in the pre-Revolutionary War period to three for the generation that has just past child bearing age. Such a decline would have been a social catastrophe had not the death rate of infants, children and youth also fallen. In the average community of a hundred years ago there were three times as many funerals among the young as now. The population has continued to grow despite the low birth rate.

But why the long and steady drop in the birth rate that has reduced births to less than three per wife today? Has human fecundity declined? Or is the cause to be caught in man's customs? Involuntary sterility is characteristic of less than 10 per cent of marriages, and today's popular one and two-child families do not in most cases represent the fecundity of the couple. Modern women are biologically capable of producing 12 to 15 children during their fertile lifetime. There is every reason to believe that the human race is as fecund today as in the days of Methuselah. The falling birth rate reflects, not a decline in human vitality, but an increase in human domestication. Social, psychological and economic factors have curbed man's fertility; there has been no weakening of the germ plasm.

Not least in importance by any means in explaining the falling birth rate is education, which has been shown to have a direct bearing on the birth rate. Clyde V. Kiser and P. K. Whelpton, studying Indianapolis wives 40-44 years of age, women whose families were practically complete, counted the number of live births per one hundred wives by the educational attainment of the wife with the following significant results:

Education of wives	*Live births per 100 wives*
College (4 or more years)	156
High school (4 years)	165
Eighth-grade education	260
Seventh-grade education	353

103323

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Less than seventh-grade education 430

These figures show clearly that the college-trained averaged only about one and a half live births a couple, the high school trained only a fraction more. The eighth-grade trained averaged more than two and a half live births; the seventh-grades three and a half; and those with less than seven grades of schooling averaged four and a third babies each.

Is Indianapolis typical of American cities? **Dr. Frank Notestein,** who has studied a large sample of American cities, found that couples with some college training had a reproduction index of only 52; an index of 100 is necessary for population replacement. This indicates that couples with college experience—many had not finished college—were 48 points below the level required for population replacement. The high school group had a reproduction index of only 68, the seventh and eighth-grade groups of 86, those with less than a seventh-grade education of 97

Other studies of the Milbank Memorial Fund show similar results for large cities.

All of these studies leave out the rural population, which has for some twenty years provided for the population increase of the nation. While no index is available for the different educational levels in rural America, the reproduction index for the total rural farm population was in 1940, according to the United States Census, 14 which is 44 points above replacement; that of the urban population 74, which is 26 points below replacement. It is likely that education of the rural population affects their birth rate in much the same way as it does that of the urban population, except that people of all educational levels in rural areas have more children than urban areas. Also, the average level of schooling of the rural population is much lower than that of the urban population.

Why this association between

FORUM

SEPTEMBER, 1945 Volume CIV, No.

Editor D. G. REDMOND

Associate Editor CAROL THOMPSON

Assistant Editor CHARLOTTE E. BRAUN

Editorial Assistants
ALICE R. CRAEMER
ALICE B. McGINTY
MARY KATHARINE STRONG

25 cents a copy
3 dollars a year

Canada 3 dollars fifty cents a year.
Foreign 4 dollars a year.

Published monthly by Events Publishing Company, Inc., 135 South Second Street, Philadelphia Pa. Editorial Office, 135 South Second Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office in Philadelphia, Pa., March 27, 1935, under the act of March 3, 1879. Indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature.* Individual copies may be secured by writing to the publication office. No responsibility is assumed for the return of unsolicited manuscripts.

Copyright 1945, by Events Publishing Company, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education and birth rate?

There are many answers, but here are some of the most important. A good education promotes favorable economic status, and a high standard of living; throughout the Western Hemisphere, a high standard of living is associated with a low birth rate. Education also increases a person's reading and social experience, which in turn multiplies wants. The educated person is more likely than the uneducated to sense the competition which exists in our kind of society between offspring and privilege, between hospital bills for babies and fur coats, automobiles and country club memberships and to choose the latter.

Births and Education

In a nation threatened a generation or so hence with a stationary or declining population and in which an increasing proportion of young people go to high school and college, the effects of education on the birth rate is of more than academic significance. Consider the educational trend. The proportion of the population 14 to 17 years of age in school (the high school group) increased from 6.7 per cent in 1890 to 32 per cent in 1920 to 73.1 per cent in 1940. The proportion of those of college age (18 to 21) in school rose from 4.0 per cent in 1900 to 8.1 per cent in 1920 to 15.3 per cent in 1940. In some states as many as 95 per These states with high educational cent of youth enter high school. attainments have low birth rates, while only agricultural states, most of them with low educational standards, have relatively high birth rates.

To get the picture more clearly, let us compare two geographic regions. In the South, where more 1940 to provide eleven children more per hundred population than were required for replacement. In the West where the mid-point in schooling is between one and two years of high school and where only eight per cent of the population has completed less than five years of school, the birth rate was five per hundred short of population replacement.

The low birth rate of the better educated is of concern not only from the standpoint of numbers but also of quality. The findings of Lewis M. Terman, psychologist of Stanford University, on this than half of the people have less than an eighth-grade education and where almost a fourth have spent less than five years in school, the birth rate was high enough in point are typical of those of many studies. He found that homes of the better educated groups produce more than their share of gifted children. In his great work, *Genetic Studies of Genius,* where he reports results of an initial study of 560 children of genius mentality, he states that professional parents, the most educated group, contributed 1,003 per cent of their normal quota of gifted children; the public-service group (public officials—postmen, military men, etc.) 137 per cent; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commercial group, 128 per cent; but the poorly educated industrial group, only 35 per cent. The failure of the educated group to perpetuate itself is certainly of importance from a eugenics standpoint.

Many years ago it was estimated that 100 Harvard men at their then current rate of marriage and reproduction would in 200 years have 50 descendants, 100 Rumanian immigrants 100,000. The Roumanian immigrants have cut down their birth rate since then, but Harvard men, like other college men, have continued to produce few children.

High school and college youth, who will determine the birth rate of the next generation, favor the small family. Of a dozen or more studies made during the last ten years asking high school and college young people their ideal number of children, all showed that the majority wanted one to three children. Few wanted more than three.

Educational Policy

What does all this mean in terms of a practical educational policy? To change the trend of the birth rate will require that the interests and motives of the youthful pupil be more family-centered. Family life as a means to personal happiness and well-being must be stressed. The appeal to individual well-being first and to national welfare only incidentally is more likely to be effective in leading the educationally favored to desire more offspring.

Courses in marriage and family in child care and training, for high school pupils, as well as for al college students, if properly han dled, can go a long way toward motivating the individual to func tion normally in the home situa tion and to find satisfaction in child-bearing and child care and training. The tendency of th school system in the past to ignor almost completely these majo functions in every normal person' life has tended to make youtl consider family life a more or les unessential or incidental function whereas he has mastered tech niques and developed interests i numerous things that will be o much less importance to the role he will play as an adult in society

The family has always bee taken for granted in much of pub lic education, it scarcely being re alized that training to be a hu band or wife, father or mother, as essential as training to be farmer, home economist, teache or minister. By ignoring famil problems, the school has contril uted its part to the philosophy o many urban youth who, when the marry, consider that children ar not necessary to the fulfillment o their marriage.

The effectiveness of domest training, considered from the viev point of the problem presente here, must depend on its orient tion of the motives of the educate youth around a desire for fami and offspring rather than simp on teaching him some of the e ternals of family behavior.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social Policy

It is likely that in the not too distant future our nation will take rather decided steps to influence the birth rate of more favored groups. Urbanization is on the increase. This, combined with education, makes it a practical certainty that the birth rate will resume its downward trend after the temporary rise that will follow the return of service men to domestic life.

These measures to maintain population when taken will include not only more complete school instruction in all phases of family life, but more specific means of an economic and social nature to ease the economic and social burden of the family with children. In our highly competitive urban-industrial society the family with children does not have an equal chance from the standpoint of standard of living and social privileges. To have children is to divide the pie into smaller slices. Even though as late as 1939 some eight million of our 36 million children under 16 years of age suffered the stigma of relief, we continued to blame the miseries of the poor to their lack of foresight and rabbit-hutch philosophy of reproduction.

The First World War gave the middle class birth control; this one is rapidly removing conscientious scruples and ignorance of birth control devices from the least privileged strata in American society. The next generation will practice birth control from top to bottom of the social pyramid. There is no mistaking that.

Our system of private medical care, under which costs have pyramided during the last two decades, has added a heavy burden and numerous anxieties to the normal load of family with children. Provision for adequate medical care on a group pre-payment basis, through national health insurance, tax-supported medicine, or some scheme making medical and hospital care available to all on a prepayment basis will be one of the first measures developed when we seriously consider easing the burden of families with children.

Provision for the distribution of foods essential to health and nutrition on a more equitable basis to families with children will, through some form of subsidized consumption. also be essential; this might be achieved by some kind of food stamp plan available to all families with children, and not simply to those with relief status, as was the case during the past decade.

Housing Programs

Measures for more adequately housing the family with children are also essential; this might be done through public housing programs, through tax concessions on real estate that is occupied by families with children, or other such devices. Some forward-looking metropolis might well take the initial step. A big city should lead the way, for in the United States the larger the city, the lower its birth rate. Studies of Bernard D. Karlayed by education, and their first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pinos and Clyde V. Kiser made in 1935 showed that cities of over 100,000 population had a reproduction index of only 72 (28 points below replacement); cities of 25,000 up to 100,000 of 83, and cities of under 25,000 of 89.

Such a move might be extremerly farsighted, for the day may come when rural areas, as their level of education increases, will no longer produce sufficient children to sustain the migration of youth into metropolitan areas and fill the places left vacant by those many near-sterile urbanites who succeed in the mighty struggle for place and position in urban life at the sacrifice of family.

Further concessions to families with children on the income tax offer possibilities. The Congress referred to the $500 exemption permitted in the 1944 revision of the income tax scale as a baby bonus, but it can hardly be considered that. The $500 exemption for a dependent child saves families in the lowest taxpaying bracket less than a third as much actual tax as it costs to provide for a child annually.

The time may come when we will consider making marriage loans to young people of high ability so that they may marry and have children while the young man finishes his education. The fact that Hitler started this system does not necessarily mean that it is without merit. One reason for the low birth rate of the educated couple is that their marriage is dechild is further delayed while they are getting on their feet economically after college graduation. The differential birth rate can scarcely be corrected unless we as a society are willing to recognize the economic problem of the youth who finds schooling and early marriage incompatible. It has been estimated that marriage at 18 years of age will produce twice as many children as the average one at 28 years of age.

In the United States now the usual age of marriage for the wife in the professional class, the most educated occupational group in the population, is 23 or 24 years compared to 18 or 19 years for the usually poorly educated wife of the laboring classes.

These are only suggestive of measures whereby educational philosophy might be modified and social policy changed to counter the problem of low fertility of the better educated groups in the population. These are not all the measures that will be needed when we become aware that social action is necessary. The important thing is that we become aware.

The less educated will have fewer children. This in time may help equalize the birth rates of the well educated and the poorly educated. But the educated will have more children only when society requires less denials and personal sacrifices of the individual who performs this social function. Less personal sacrifice will be required only when the community takes over a greater share of the cost and risk.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Role of Unions in Reconversion

By Mark Starr

Educational Director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union

From New York City—where nost city employers think of the ittle Flower as Poison Ivy—to ne new World Trade Union Conerence—in which the AFL will ave no part because it maintains nat Soviet unions in government wned and operated industries are ot "free"—the tactics and status f unions of city, state and federal mployees and the immediate and uture role of unions as they adance from collective bargaining collective planning are imporint matters of current discussion. lor is the matter likely to lessen in nportance, for in Canada and reat Britain the Canadian Comonwealth Federation and the ritish Labor party, respectively, ropose to apply public ownership basic industries.

In the United States public enrprise, having materially helped win the war, must be used in ne urgent problems of conversion. lready it has been suggested that ne gargantuan Willow Run plant e run through cooperation between the United Auto Workers nd the government to produce gricultural equipment, box cars or the railroads and road transort vehicles to rehabilitate indusial life in devastated Europe and sia. Alternatively, R. J. Thomas ppealed to Henry J. Kaiser to ke over the plant for the mass roduction of low-price autos, Mr. aiser having been the industrialist who has sold most to Uncle Sam.

Instead, then, of nostalgically singing the mammy songs of our economic childhood or trying to "go back to grandfather" (to quote Stuart Chase), we should examine both the huge wartime government corporations (without which the war could not have been won) and the earlier examples of public ownership and public services. On this basis a policy could be formulated which would give to unions of government employees appropriate status and recognition; to technicians and directors responsibility and opportunities for initiative; and to the community the benefit of effectively operated public utilities and services. This must be done while cutting out the bureaucracy and regimentation which usually come as part of "the curse of bigness" whether in the large corporation or in large-scale government services.

Admittedly, the hokum which wishful thinking in the United States has made out of Hayek has some basis in fact. Long ago Shakespeare wrote: "He owns my life who owns the means whereby I live." Government in business needs the safeguards of workers' unions and consumers' organizations against the "servile state" that Hilaire, Belloc and G.K. Chesterton attacked some 30 years ago in Britain, when the nationaliza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of industries was first seriously proposed in the homeland of capitalism.

History echoes the responses made then to that danger — the Wobblies' industrial unions ("building the new within the shell of the old"); the revolutionary syndicalism of Sorel in France; the parlor syndicalism and propaganda for "workers' control" of the British National Guilds League; the factory soviets, whose controls did not survive the early years of the Russian Revolution. But apart from some vague phrases about workers' participation in the administration of nationalized industries, little was left of these modifications of State Socialism to counter critics who said it paved the road to serfdom. Much has happened since, however, and if history does repeat itself it comes with many variations.

We can now rob collectivism of many of its dangers if we work out an appropriate status for the trade unions functioning in industries owned and operated by the government. Our aim should be to give to publicly-owned corporations enough independence to protect them from the daily harrassment of petty politicians, while at the same time giving power to the responsible executives to demonstrate their efficiency as a measuring stick to management of other concerns.

Fortunately, there are excellent examples of such "administrative democracy." David E. Lilienthal in *Democracy on the March* says "Active labor-management cooperation between organized workers and the TVA, now widely known and generally approved, could never have come about if Congress had provided for any division of responsibility for personnel management as between TVA's management and some other agency." The TVA thus avoided the "rigid hierarchical organizations" of the British civil service. It secured a working relationship with employees which "establishes confidence and fosters enthusiasm and zest for the task," while reserving questions of general policy to Congress and its appointed executives.

Once the unions are recognized and mutual confidence established, then they can think in terms of community and regional well being. Again to quote Mr. Lilienthal:

"Around the wage conference table the intensity of this faith in the valley and labor's desire to help to build its future are repeated again and again. Once a year union officials, flanked by delegates from each of the major jobs, meet with management to work out adjustments in wages working rules, and supplements to their basic agreement with TVA On these occasions and in frequent joint meetings on other subjects there is ever-increasing evidence that the TVA to them is more than a place to work. They show this too, even in the formal briefs presented by the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council through which the fifteen building and metal trades unions represent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

g some 25,000 employees present management their facts, arguents, and ideas.

"The leaders of organized labor, s they participate in the affairs f the TVA, inject a strong note f realism into problems to be aced for the region's partnership vith the TVA. They, like the demnstration farmer, carry the lessons of TVA into the daily stream of ife and affairs throughout the valey."

In corroboration of Mr. Lilienal's claims, Marion H. Hedges of e International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers publicly stated n May, 1945, that strikes had been liminated and jurisdictional disputes overcome.

"Workers on the TVA have been eal pioneers in a pioneer moveent, and by their skill, loyalty, patience, forbearance, restraint and ntelligence, have made the TVA a remarkable success.

"Earning a living at TVA, therefore, has been not merely an ecohomic task, but also a part of a great adventure, participated in by iterally hundreds of thousands of members of organized labor; and management will, I believe, state emphatically that the union coperative arrangements have enabled the TVA to do the great job hat it has been called upon to do.

"The TVA in its planned development as a region has been a laboratory great enough and small enough so that the effect of good abor - management arrangements can be marked from year to year and measured as to effect. The effect has been immediate and salutary."

But, after all, TVA is only a pilot plant in American industry. Special needs created it and it has aided private business interests in the region just as the government Post Office has aided business throughout the nation. Selling our citizens the government operation of Willow Run would be more difficult. The cry already goes up "Get government out of business," ignoring the fact that because the Lilienthals are too few, many business men have never forgotten their own interests even while they were in government employ. All too few people recognize that government "interference" in industry will now be compelled to go farther than emergency pump priming, headed up by individuals who do not understand the new creative role of government. In this sense we need to get business out of the government.

The unions, notably in the Reuther Plan, were more foresighted than the employers in the matter of converting the auto plants to the production of tanks and planes. They might well now take the lead in the same way and work out plans for the conversion of the government-owned plants.

The significance of this step in making democracy real instead of increasing regimentation cannot be exaggerated. The reluctance and unpreparedness of the most of the unions to champion public ownership (beyond certain pragmatic individual applications) and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers' participation in control; the challenged and uncertain legal status of unions in the government service plus their own weakness and visions; the possibility that with cutbacks creating mass unemployment, the Sewell Averys will win out over the Eric Johnstons and quickly scrap the advances made by labor-management committees; the friction that will be caused by men and women hunting jobs and being pushed back into low paid industries after the wartime boom, thus resulting in a turbulent period of industrial unrest—these are also parts of our current problem.

The New Deal taught the American people the powers of government as a last resort to create employment. Unions, greatly increased in their strength, have rightly claimed a say in the planning of industry and aided by competent administrators and technicians, they can aid materially in the problems of reconversion.

* * *

● "All this seemed to mean that La Follette, a hard and skillful fighter, was going to oppose, when the time came, the U. S. Senate's ratification of whatever charter came out of San Francisco."

—*Time*

* * *

● "La Follette's speech was no appeal to isolation. It was instead a broad appeal to practical internationalism . . . Moreover, the Wisconsin Senator made it clear that he was ready to support a world organization operating on a majority rule principle and entailing a consequent sacrifice of United States sovereignty."

—*Newsweek, same week, same speech*

* * *

● Having finished a lesson on the Feast of the Passover, a church-school teacher asked, "Now, why was it that Mary and Joseph took Jesus with them to Jerusalem."

Mary, aged four, smiled understandingly. "I guess," she ventured, "they didn't have a sister."

—*Parents' Magazine*

* * *

● When Secretary of State Byrnes was travelling with President Truman to the Potsdam meeting, many State Department employees were wondering whether or not they would still have jobs when the department reorganization got underway as the new Secretary got down to brass tacks. The motto of the organization became: "The State Department fiddles while Byrnes roams."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is It Too Late To Stop Inflation?

By Colston E. Warne
Professor of Economics, Amherst College; President, Consumers Union

● For more than a decade, prophets of despair have been predicting run-away prices. First this was to result from the devaluation of the dollar and to the monetary reforms of 1933. Then it was to be brought about by the deficit spending of the New Deal. More recently the prediction has been based upon the unprecedented rise of the Federal debt which is now well past $250,000,000,000.

In spite of these gloomy forecasts, the price level has, on the whole, behaved quite well. After five years of war preparation and war, wholesale commodity prices are, according to United States Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, approximately at the 1926 level. The same is true of the cost of living, although this index is less trustworthy. We have, to be sure, had price increases from the low levels of the mid-'thirties. We have not, however, had more than a slight taste of such a price upswing as emerged with the last war and reached its high crest in the summer of 1920.

A plausible case might even be made today that the long-predicted inflation will not emerge; indeed that the years ahead will be more apt to bring deflationary problems. We have built during the war an enormous productive capacity which is prepared to flood the country with peace-time goods. The sheer weight of commodities will, it is contended, be sufficient to prevent any price spiral. Moreover, any exaggerated buying boom would seem unlikely in a period in which production cutbacks have lowered family incomes. As the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion states: "The remembrance of the depression is clear to most of us. At the first development of widespread unemployment, even those who are not unemployed may feel econonomically insecure and will freeze on to their savings and spend less. This would be bound to deflate demand; manufacturers would be less anxious to expand; and instead of coming out of the war with an expanding economy and jobs for released veterans and war workers we will face another depression."

This danger may be minimized if reconversion proceeds rapidly. It is nevertheless distinctly a factor in the current price picture which cannot be ignored. Emerging from this war with more efficient capital in many fields, with new products to be introduced, and with business and governmental agencies given the period between V-E day and V-J day to plan the transition, we may be able to strike a happy balance between inflation and deflation which will permit us in the post-war period to retain a $160,000,000,000 annual level of national production. Given wise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies of taxation, banking, foreign trade flow, of international lending, and of price and wage stabilization we may serenely come through the difficult period. Yet the doubt persists: will we?

II.

It is equally possible to assemble a highly plausible case for rapid and severe inflation. Money in circulation and bank deposits now total $152,000,000,000, almost triple the 1929 level of 55,000,000,000. Liquid assets in the hands of individuals and corporations total $230,000,000,000; 200 per cent higher than in 1939. The War Mobilization Director comments: "Such a volume of funds cannot be counted on to lie fallow indefinitely. Indeed, the rise in the cost of urban and farm real estate and in the prices of stocks over recent months suggests that they had been seeking outlets." And, it should be noted that when spent by one person, these funds most commonly become the liquid assets of a second person who may in turn accelerate the speculative boom.

With the demand for commodities pent up during the period of war restrictions, with manufacturers already starting to scramble for supplies of raw materials, and with OPA and WPB controls steadily weakening, we have the beginnings of inflation. Once producers see clearly that prices are rising, their efforts to accumulate inventories to protect themselves and to enhance their profits will accelerate the rise. We have in the present price picture the makings of another 1919.

Apart from these forces is the pressure of advancing costs. The war has increased the profit expectation of business men. In the overall picture their profits have tripled from the pre-war level. Managerial salaries have increased. They will be unlikely to price on narrow margins, hoping that the volume of business will suffice to give them an adequate return. They have already challenged OPA's pricing formula for reconversion and will be increasingly anxious to remove the last vestige of federal price control. Workers, too, will wish to retain the same level of take-home pay and include in their wage for 40 hours the same remuneration that was previously received when extensive overtime was paid. Though this policy has much to be said in its favor, it is apt in many industries to bring a sharp advance in production costs and consequently marked price increases. Business men will be reluctant to allow their agumented wage bill to cut into profits and will instead use the wages as a convenient excuse for added charges to the customer.

The nature of federal financing of the war affords another ground for pessimism. Savings bonds may readily be cashed and are likely to be quickly disposed of in favor of the chrome allure of the new car. Installment payments, now at low ebb and under government restriction, are certainly going to be stimulated when again the salesman

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

omes into his own. Will these orces trip off the fatal spiral? 'axation, long a deterent of spending, is likely to be prematurely apered off due to its unpopularty. Will this mean an increased ederal deficit on the one hand ınd expanded buying on the ›ther?

In the foreign trade field, other ıations have accumulated more han $6,000,000,000 of dollar ights against America. Will these ›ountries make extensive demands or our goods, demands which are upplemented by extensive capital ınd credit grants from American ›anks and corporations? Will we n this way start an inflationary ›ycle both in our own country ınd abroad?

III.

It is, as may be observed, easy to observe that strong tendencies operate in the American picture toward both inflation and deflaıion. The question then is: which set of forces is the stronger and the more pervasive? *Fortune Magazine* contends that "the U. S. is experiencing what might be called monetary inflation without yet suffering the bitterest fruits of outright inflation." They add that monetary inflation "turns quickly into price inflation." The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion hedges in his July 1, 1945 report: "We must be prepared for inflation and deflation, or for a delayed inflation after an immediate deflation following V-J day." This somewhat involved advice is followed by the admonition that we must "get rid of controls that are not needed and retain controls that help." He concludes that the huge financial reserves of the war period "can be a self-starter for our post-war economy, and if handled right, a 'fly-wheel' for years to come." He indicates that the Government must take the major responsibility for insuring high-level production. He proposes a nine point program as a "postwar economic charter" for a steadily rising American living standard:

"1. *Taxation.* A complete modernization of tax laws to help achieve stable high levels of employment and production.

"2. *Small business.* A program to foster small business and encourage the birth of new business.

"3. *Competition.* A fair, vigorous, anti-monopoly program because competition is a keynote to our free society.

"4. *Labor, Management and Wages.* Measures to reduce industrial strife, the broadening of the minimum wage laws and the encouragement of a high wage policy by business.

"5. *Foreign Trade.* The breaking down of artificial barriers to trade and positive measures to encourage world trade.

"6. *Social Security.* The broadening and expansion of unemploymen compensation, old-age pensions, health and education programs of federal, state, and local governments.

"7. *Farm Program.* Measures to assure the farm population an opportunity to enjoy the same standard of living, health and educational facilities as the rest of the American people.

"8. *Public Works and Construction.* A long-term program of public works tied in with the government's fiscal policy, and a pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gram to encourage far greater volume of private construction for housing than we have ever had in the past.

"9. *Fiscal Policy.* A fiscal policy aimed at maintaining the economy at or near full employment, and coordinating all government programs that have either an inflationary or deflationary effect."

This program, in its bare outline, appears ambiguous to say the least. It does, nevertheless, clearly suggest that our governmental policies, wise or unwise, will be a substantial determinant of our postwar trend toward either inflation or deflation. Director Vinson wants, more specifically, the repeal of the excess profits tax, the modification of taxes on business earnings to give additional incentive for risk-taking and expansion. He wishes the elimination "as far as possible" of sales and excise taxes and acceptance of the personal income tax, on a broad base, as the chief source of tax revenue. In his new capacity as Secretary of the Treasury, he will be in a position to influence the Congress to adopt such a fiscal program.

On the business front, loans and technical assistance are suggested for small business. Anti-trust laws should be enforced with adequate appropriations. The Surplus Property Board should combat business concentration in its property disposals. Our patent system should be revised to prevent the use of inventions as "a means of dividing markets, restricting output, or setting prices." "Understanding and tolerance" are counselled in labor relations and a high wage policy endorsed. The increase of the floor under wages from the present 40 cent minimum to 50 cents is suggested.

In the foreign trade field, the keynote is the freer movement of goods and capital and economic stability and the operation of the International Bank, the International Stabilization Fund and the strengthening of the Export-Import Bank. War obligations should be cleared up "on a realistic basis."

The expansion of the social security system to include medical and hospital care and larger unemployment and old age benefits is urged, not only as humanitarian policy but as "a necessary factor in maintaining mass purchasing power, which in turn is the basis of full employment."

On the farm problem, support is given to the idea that farm prices be permitted to drop to their "natural level" and that the government make up the differences by direct payments from the United States Treasury. This would permit the consumer to reap the benefits of lower prices and would place the government in the position of steering the farmer toward more profitable crops.

In the construction field, the need is indicated for 1,250,000 new non-farm dwellings a year for ten years. Federal projects in low-cost housing areas should be timed to stabilize employment at high levels. New building methods should be introduced to lower costs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Above all, the federal budget must be managed "in relation to the total economic situation." We should frankly employ a budgetary policy of economic stabilization, varying our public spending in accordance with the slack in private spending. To that end, the Full Employment Bill is endorsed in principle.

While the aspirations expressed in this program look well on paper, a sense of political realism would suggest that they will probably not be speedily fulfilled. Congress has adjourned until October. On its agenda remain the principal domestic measures suggested by Mr. Vinson, many of which will be most hotly contested by conservatives who are far from convinced of their wisdom. OPA has been continued until June, 1946, but its future is by no means insured beyond that date. In both the House and Senate, groups of liberal members have coalesced into a bloc to seek consideration of the program.

Meanwhile, many of the forces which are driving us toward inflation are proceeding apace. The federal budget for the current year is $85,288,000,000, only a little below that of last year. The war expenditure portion of the budget is $70,000,000,000. Expenditures will exceed receipts this year by $46,000,000,000 as compared with a deficiency of $57,000,000,000 last year.

These figures take on added importance when it is appreciated that nearly half of the outstanding government bonds ($98,000,000,000 in April, 1945) have been bought by commercial banks and Federal Reserve Banks and have been used to create additional money supplies. Furthermore, in the Sixth War Loan drive, about half of those who bought bonds did so by increasing their bank borrowings. Much of the Seventh War Loan was handled in the same way. This dependence upon the banks for the financing of the war is but a polite method of issuing the counterpart of greenbacks. Existing savings of individuals remain entirely intact and ready to purchase goods. An entirely new account is opened by the purchasing bank to the credit of the government which, when disbursed becomes a part of our monetary supply.

The problem is not, however, wholly monetary. It is in even greater measure psychological. Business is moving rapidly to eliminate production and price controls and has, to date, met with considerable success. The OPA has given ground in textiles, in livestock, in steel and in its general reconversion pricing formula. The WPB has opened the gateway wide to speculation and commodity grabbing in many fields. It appears indisposed to hold on the lid. The rise of land values is more than ominous. These, incorporated into business costs, can only spell higher prices and extended disequilibrium. Although it is polite to make gestures toward small bus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iness, all appearances suggest that the huge cash surpluses are held by our larger corporations and that they will reap rich rewards from surplus property and tax rebates.

The present probability is that we shall move, quicker than we realize, toward inflation. The stage is set. Within that inflation will undoubtedly be areas of deflation—industries which cannot because of over-capacity join the upward procession. We shall doubtless have many jobless on our ascent. The displacement of workers is proceeding rapidly and will probably leave many stranded in the wrong places without adequate provision for their support. As the boom gathers momentum and living costs rise, increased labor unrest will occur. Labor will seek frantically but unsuccessfully to boost wages as rapidly as price increases occur. Mounting labor costs will, of themselves, give impetus to the price spiral. Values of fixed incomes will drop. Inequality will be exaggerated. Personal suffering will be great. Subsequent deflationary consequences will be equally severe.

It is interesting to note that most of the administration's program is seemingly concerned with the question of preventing deflationary trends. On the face of it, it is an attempt to make business more profitable, to establish planned public work and to guarantee farm prices. Inflationary possibilities are given but little attention. Nevertheless, to the extent to which its plans afford an output stimulus without enlarging the nation's money supply, it might be considered as a means of checking inflation. So much depends upon who has the savings, upon the use to which funds are put, and upon the current distribution of income that it may well be that a program which serves to avoid deflation may also, if well designed, serve to prevent over-stimulation of the economic system in other sectors.

The probabilities are, however, that we shall not move consciously and consistently along the line of this or any other program. Moved by slogans of free enterprise, we are entering serenely the inflationary period with scant misgivings. We have been too often fooled by unfounded warnings of rising prices to introduce essential safeguards. Perhaps experience will be a better teacher.

● Our friend the bartender swears to the veracity of the visit of three men to his place of business.

"Coke," said the first.

"Orangeade," said the second.

"Water," said the third. "I'm driving."

—*The Postage Stamp*

* * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY ATTLEE?

By Morley G. Dilke

On July 27, 1945, the results of the British National Election were made public. Mr. Churchill flew from Potsdam to London to learn that the Conservative party had been badly beaten and that he was no longer Prime Minister. By the first week in August it was relatively easy to meet Americans who had predicted the inevitable result.

But perhaps they were cheating a little. The August issue of the largest weekly news-magazine in this country, unquestionably well-informed, ran not a painting of Mr. Attlee but a photograph of him on its front cover. Although the week before the editors had made a carefully guarded statement that the Labor party might win, they had not been sufficiently confident to run the cover of Mr. Attlee in color.

Three weeks before, most newspapers were saying that Mr. Churchill, aided by a large Liberal vote, would be able to maintain a majority in Commons for his government, even if the Conservatives did not have a clear-cut majority.

Though many people now say that an Attlee victory was obvious, it was natural to assume that the war leader of a victorious nation would win an election held within 60 days of victory. Winston Churchill was not merely a war leader. Like Cassandra, he was a prophet of approaching and inevitable conflict. Unlike Cassandra, his prophecies were heeded at least in part and unlike Troy, England held out against the enemy.

Even before the First World War, in 1910, Churchill had called attention to the danger of war with Germany. He wrote a now-famous memorandum to the Committee of Imperial Defense on what Germany might do in case of war on the continent. In 1911, when he became First Lord of the Admiralty, Churchill kept the fleet in a constant state of readiness, and in July, 1914, he put the fleet through a test mobilization at Spithead to prepare for the coming conflict.

During the period of disarmament and appeasement after the First World War, Churchill became known as a "Cassandra" and "warmonger." In 1932, after the Lausanne Disarmament Conference, he declared that "Britain's hour of weakness is Europe's hour of danger." Even before the Munich agreement of 1938, Churchill was advocating increased production of airplanes and national conscription. While the great majority of British people rejoiced in Chamberlain's "peace in our time," Churchill warned them darkly: "You were given the choice between war and dishonor. You have chosen dishonor and you will have war."

When the war he had so often predicted caught England unprepared, when the Low Countries

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collapsed and France surrendered, when the British were beaten on the beaches of Dunquerque, it was Churchill to whom they turned and Churchill who pulled them through "blood, sweat and tears" to victory. On the face of it, the Germans were defeated when they accepted "unconditional surrender" in May, 1945, and on the face of it, England and Churchill had won the war.

Whatever Churchill's economic and political beliefs may be, he is not a believer in economic determinism: he believed that the English had a clear choice of governments and parties and that an election would give them a chance to express this choice. It must not be forgotten that it was Churchill who insisted on an election either in June or after V-J Day, assuming that at either time the English would give him a vote of gratitude for winning the war. The Labor party undoubtedly feared that this assumption was correct: they offered to delay the election until October, in the obvious hope that the further from actual victory the election was held, the more unpopular Churchill would become.

Nonetheless, Churchill lost the election. The Conservatives had been losing steadily in by-elections since 1935, when they held control of the House with 387 out of 615 seats. By the time the election was held they had only 358 seats and in the newly elected Commons they will have only 195 seats. At the same time the Liberal party lost 7 of their 18 seats, returning only 11 members to an overwhelmingly pro-Labor Commons. In the new House Labor holds about the same majority that the Conservative party held in 1935 and polled the same percentage of popular votes: 51 per cent of the total. In effect this means that the Labor cabinet can probably count on a solid Labor majority in the Commons and that only a split in the Labor party itself can bring dissolution inside of the five-year term.

Generally speaking, people vote in an election either *for* something or *against* something or both for and against something. In addition, there are certain obvious extraneous factors the relative importance of which it is difficult to assess. In the British election, war-weariness was undoubtedly an extraneous factor — and a very important one. It includes dislike for all the restrictions characteristic of a nation at war and particularly characteristic of an island nation such as Britain. This is an obvious and easy explanation of Churchill's defeat but it may not be the true one. Most simple explanations of so startling an overturn as this are not complete.

It is certain that many people were voting against war restrictions and possible that they were also registering a protest against a man, a party, a class, a viewpoint. Churchill put himself in the position where the election could be interpreted as a personal repudiation. No one in England was willing to grant him this. As Sir William Beveridge pointed out in one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his own campaign speeches: "Only Woodford, Essex, can vote or Mr. Churchill. I hope that oodford will send him back to arliament, but the fewer other ories sent there to hamper him he better . . . "

The opposition was more than illing to grant that Churchill was a great leader, hampered by his connection with a party, a class and a viewpoint no longer able to solve England's domestic problems. Churchill had been in opposition to his party leadership most of his life. For practical political reasons he could not stress this. The Labor party thought, and rightly, that the Tory label would sink Churchill. The Conservatives hoped that Churchill might save their class, party and viewpoint.

Some of the electors probably thought that they were repudiating all three. According to the results of Gallup Poll, seven out of ten voters were displeased with the Government's handling of the housing situation. In January, 1945, seven out of ten with opinions on the nationalization of the railroads approved the idea. In April, two out of three with opinions approved of the nationalization of land. Sixty per cent favored the nationalization of coal mines. By May, a poll shows a "substantial sentiment" for "nationalization of the Bank of England."

According to Anne O'Hare McCormick, the British were also influenced by the higher living standards and higher pay of the American Army. "They voted for automobiles, better clothes, mass-production factories, more spending power, modern conveniences." Clifton Daniel, also writing in *The New York Times*, maintains that "It is now apparent that by installing a Labor Government at Westminster the British people intended to make a clean break with the past—the past of unemployment and doles, the past of war and suffering, the past of unfulfilled promises and national frustration."

They undoubtedly voted against the Tory party, the party of appeasement under Baldwin and Chamberlain, special privilege, monopoly capitalism as opposed to collective socialism, and Tory imperialism. At the same time a large majority also repudiated the class of special privilege for which the Tories stood.

Whether or not they also repudiated a view-point is more questionable. To begin with, viewpoints of political leaders are seldom carried to their logical conclusions and, if they were, we should have not two or three parties, but many. Mr. Churchill, in 1939, was a Conservative, but not an appeaser. Mr. Chamberlain was the leader of the Conservatives, the Prime Minister, and the man who said that Munich would lead to "peace in our time."

Mr. Churchill is not, and never was, a good party man. Like his father, he is first of all a Tory by birth. The Tories, in Lord Randolph Churchill's day, were the party of the landed aristocracy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their opponents were the Liberals. The Tories stood for protection of agriculture and for a colonial system that enabled Britain to profit by its control of Colonial peoples.

The Liberals were ideological Free Traders. Because, in Britain, the conflict of the moment seemed to be over the Corn Laws rather than over the theoretical value of free trade, many manufacturers became Liberals on immediate practical grounds. As they saw it, if the cost of bread went down, either labor could buy more of other goods or the wages paid to labor could be reduced. In either case the manufacturers would benefit.

As manufacturing grew the advantages of ownership in machinery or mechanical processing became as apparent as the advantage of ownership in land. The advantages of monopoly proved to be even greater in a mechanized society. Basically, vested interests are created in either the ownership of land or of machinery when the possibility of competition with the owners is restricted or removed. High priced products of machinery need protection even more than high priced farm products. Therefore, the manufacturers eventually saw the benefits to be obtained by tariffs and this powerful segment of the Liberal party turned Conservative. The Conservatives remained the party of special privilege and protection and the Liberals stood as the exponents of Free Trade.

One viewpoint that was certainly repudiated in this election was the free trade policy of the Liberal party. The Labor party, like the Conservative, has distinct protectionist leanings, because it too is a special privilege party. As inequalities grew men inevitably combined to fight them. The trade unions were originally associations of skilled men who sought to gain a higher wage for their work. Ideologically they should have preferred that this higher wage should come out of profits. But in fact it has more often come out of higher prices. There are two factors involved in the maintenance of high prices—restriction of production as an internal policy and protection as a foreign policy. As they fought for higher wages the trade unions inevitably espoused both.

Restriction of production includes not only all restrictions advantageous to the machine owner but also restrictions advantageous to the machine operator, i.e., apprenticeship as a method of delaying entry into a trade, and what is sometimes called feather-bedding in this country. The British Labor party is definitely based on trade unionism. As long ago as 1914, in "Industrial Democracy," by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, the statement is made that "By the method of collective bargaining . . . trade unions have not infrequently gained from employers, at times of strategic advantage, not only the whole of their demands, but also conditions so exceptional that they would never have ventured to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embody them in a legislative proposal. We shall . . . see how this consideration deters strong trade unions . . . from going to Parliament about such unsettled problems as demarcation of work or he limitation of apprentices, on which they feel that they can exact better terms than would be conceded to them by the community as a whole."[1].

In the field of foreign policy high prices inevitably lead to both imperialism and protection. Only the owner of an empire can sell at a high price and buy at a low one. Even the owner of an empire cannot make the citizens of the home country pay high prices for their own products if the products of other countries can enter the home market at lower prices.

That the Labor party at least partially recognizes this is indicated by a speech that Ernest Bevin, now Foreign Secretary, made in the recent campaign when he asserted that "Revolutions do not change geography."

A group of five British Trade Union Congress officials, headed by Sir Walter Citrine, made a welve-day trip to Athens in February, 1945, to investigate British intervention, and on their return upheld British policy as wholeheartedly as Mr. Churchill. At the annual Labor party conference, Ernest Bevin defended the same policy: "The steps which have been taken in Greece are not the decisions of Mr. Churchill. They are the decisions of the Cabinet."

From the above analysis it seems clear that neither special privilege, monopoly or imperialism were basic points at issue in the campaign. Churchill's statement: "I did not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire," important as it may seem over here, was not seriously challenged. In fact, both parties promised a more abundant life in England and hoped that Wavell would solve the Indian problem without affecting the British standard of living. Mr. Churchill's intervention in Syria, regarded by some Americans as an example of British imperialism, was wholeheartedly endorsed by Clement Attlee during the campaign. Basic agreement in the domestic field can be inferred from the following incident. Lord Beaverbrook attacked Mr. Bevin for showing totalitarian tendencies in his mobilization of manpower during the campaign. Mr. Bevin replied: "I have been waiting for a repudiation of the speech from the Prime Minister, to which I think I am entitled, bearing in mind that these regulations were all brought in at the request of my colleagues."

The parties had worked together in the cabinet. When the break came each accused the other of jockeying for position to win the election. This left to the voter the question of which party's promise would be likely to be fulfilled.

As leader of the Conservatives, Winston Churchill promised a 14-point domestic policy: a high and

[1]Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Industrial Democracy* (London, 1914), p. 255.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stable level of employment; better housing; stable markets and prices for agriculture; a new insurance plan; a comprehensive health service; improved primary schools; all possible encouragement of foreign trade; stimulation of scientific research for industry; control of monopolies; removal of war controls as quickly as possible; encouragement of small business and help for the ex-service man; fuel and power industry control; improved transportation; amelioration of the tax burden. The Labor party, to obtain the same goals, advocated nationalization of the railroads, the mines, and the Bank of England. This, apparently, seemed to the people of England a more practical way of attaining the Tory aims for all. This policy will not affect Britain's basic difficulty. To prosper both parties say she must regain her foreign trade. Monopolists have restrictioned production to increase wages. British Socialism has restricted production to increase wages. Both have increased prices, and increased prices have gradually strangled foreign trade.

* * *

● It would appear that the mechanical machines of the government aren't keeping pace with latest governmental policies. Reporters assigned to the Treasury Department have asked that the electric adding machine in the press room be replaced. The computer, installed during Coolidge's administration, computes only a high as millions.

* * *

● A restaurant in Rochester still has faith in human nature. It sports a glass bowl filled with cigarettes, with a sign reading: "If you haven't any, take one; if you have, deposit one."

* * *

America Views the Atomic Bomb

● Two gentle old ladies from out of town stood gazing at a toy display in a five and dime store window. Said one: "Why not buy him a toy battleship or a tank; they look pretty." Replied the other, a modern soul; "Oh, no! Remember what he said; nothing but an atomic bomb."

* * *

● A robust gentleman in an elevator commented to his friend with confidence: "I'm not worried about the Japanese discovering the secret of the atomic bombz. If they find one they'll never be smart enough to eake it apart and figure out how it works."

* * *

● Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.
—*Thomas Jefferson*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South American Power Politics

By Harry Banta Murkland
Editor and Specialist on Latin American Affairs

Whether we like it or not, whether we call it by that name or some other, the world of the future is going to be a world of power politics. Russia, Great Britain and the United States control most of the available power, so they will dominate that world. Small nations may advise and influence and contribute, but no one of them alone will be able to act importantly.

No one alone. But it is possible that a combination might be able to make its weight felt. There is such a combination, ready-made, in the inter-American system. It is worth while to inquire, therefore, what part of Latin America is likely to play in post-war international politics.

It has been apparent, ever since the Dumbarton Oaks talks, that the Latin American countries meant to make their voices heard. They considered that small countries were brushed off by large ones at the Washington meetings, and they were prompt to inform the United States State Department to that effect. They brought the subject up again at the Chapultepec Conference and prepared a formal presentation of their views for the San Francisco Conference which followed soon after. They were active and influential at San Francisco, where their twenty votes were almost half of the total and, cast together, out-voted any other likely combination of states. The hand of Latin America is clearly impressed on such an important section of the United Nations Charter as the compromise agreement which is intended to reconcile regional security pacts with a world security organization.

The activity of the Latin Americans, particularly their tendency to vote as a bloc and usually on the same side as the United States, obviously bothered some of the European delegates, particularly the Russians, who saw a possibility that they might be steam-rollered by sheer force of numbers. Is there any substance to these fears—or hopes, depending on the point of view? Can Latin America play an important part in power politics? Are these twenty nations likely to operate permanently as a bloc? And will they always, or generally, throw their influence behind the United States?

The direct function of Latin America in international affairs has been made clear during the Second World War. It will be largely geographic, economic and political—and the greatest of these is political.

There is no significant military strength in Latin America, nor is there likely to be. Only Mexico and Brazil have taken part in the actual fighting, and Mexico's contribution is a token rather than a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measurable force. Brazil's effort was more tangible, but it is extremely doubtful if the military potential of that vast but undeveloped and sparsely inhabited country can be built up to international significance within the foreseeable future.

Strategic Contributions

The geographic and economic contributions of the Latin American nations to the United Nations war effort have been more notable. Bases in the Caribbean area and in northern South America have guarded the Panama Canal. Other bases on the bulge of Brazil helped keep the stream of men and materials flowing from the United States to North African and European battlefronts. And the mines, fields and forests of Latin America made up for many economic deficiencies caused by Japanese conquest of most of the Far East. But in all this, Latin America was an instrument in the hands of the United States rather than an independent agent: the United States largely built and manned the bases, and United States money and technicians developed the continent's economy.

It is in the political field that Latin America has been and will be most important, for Latin America can, in many cases, make or mar an international policy of the United States.

It is not safe to assume that the countries to the south of us will always "make" our policy. The tendency to hail the war-time development of continental unity as something permanent and immutable is a hasty conclusion based on a false premise. The premise is, of course, that the Latin Americans will always react as they did this time.

But why? It was not devotion to the United States nor, in many cases, to democracy, that rallied Latin America to the United Nations at the beginning of this war; it was self-defense and self-interest. That is not said with any intent to belittle; no intelligent statesman would conduct his country's foreign policy on any other basis. But it is something to think about. For if an international issue arises—and conceivably it could—in which the interests of Latin American countries were not the same as ours, there is no reason to suppose that they would follow our lead.

There have already been signs that their willingness to do so is weakening as the war nears its end. One of the leading Latin American cooperators, for example, was the former Mexican Foreign Minister, Ezequiel. His cooperation has cost him his job and practically destroyed his ambition to be President of Mexico. Other factors were involved in his downfall, but his "subserviency" to the United States at San Francisco was the biggest of the clubs with which his enemies beat him down. The governments of Mexico and the United States have walked hand in hand during the war. The Mexican government is prepared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to go on doing so, and there is no specific current international issue to separate them. But the ouster of Padilla is a fat straw to show that a significant part of Mexican public opinions wants to resume an independent path.

The Argentine case is another example of Latin American independence. Premature United States recognition of the orginal revolutionary government of June, 1943, was virtually forced by the fact that several of Argentina's neighbors had already recognized the Colonels. One important reason why hemisphere policy toward Buenos Aires has been so confused and uncertain since then is the difficulty of reconciling United States and Latin American opinions. And in spite of assertions to the contrary, it is pretty clear that it was Latin American pressure on the State Department, rather than vice versa, that brought about the admission of Argentina to the United Nations Conference.

This is not to suggest that, as a result of the Good Neighbor Policy, there may not be more effective cooperation between Latin America and the United States in the future than there was in the past. The point is that the somewhat artificial, defensive clustering of the small and comparatively weak nations to the south around the strength of the Colossus of the North during the war is not likely to continue. Their interests were clearly with ours during the Fascist-Nazi assault; they may be less clearly so in the political maneuvering after the war. Not only it is unlikely that we will always be able to rally them to our standard; we may sometimes, as in the case of Argentina, have to modify our own policy to fit theirs.

Our willingness to do so is one of the most significant developments in recent inter-American policy. There was no sign, at the Mexico City Conference, of any attempt by Washington to bear down on the Latin Americans. They were listened to carefully and at length, and many pages of the Final Act bear witness to United States readiness to compromise, and to take the other American republics into the fullest possible partnership. One fact emerges clearly from the war-time history of the Western Hemisphere. When the twenty-one American republics act or speak jointly in the future, the Latin Americans will have had a larger part in formulating the speech and action than they have had in the past.

No Automatic Bloc

In other words, there is no very substantial reason to suppose that, in the international councils of the future, the United States will automatically cast twenty-one votes. The votes may be cast on the same side; it may even be understood in advance that they will be. But if so, it will be because all the nations of the Western Hemisphere consider that the policy in question is to their advantage, and not because the United States has told them so, and has corralled the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

votes of its neighbors for a policy which Washington wants and they do not. It is, of course, impossible to get around the fact that the United States is, and always will be, so much stronger in every way than the Latin American countries that it will exert a tremendous influence, direct and indirect, over them. But unless we are so unwise as to scrap our present Good Neighbor Policy, that influence will not be unlimited and it will never be forced. There seems little reason to fear a hemisphere bloc dominated by the United States.

It is unlikely, in fact, that there will even be a Latin American bloc. For Latin America has its own continental power politics to play within the broader international system. The Latin American nations are not twenty tweedledums and tweedledees which look alike, think alike and act alike; they are twenty separate republics, each with its own interests *vis a vis* the others as well as the rest of the world. And the internal continental situation may at times prove more important than the international.

This becomes more apparent the farther one gets from Washington. Mexico is large and strong enough to be something of a special case; but the tiny republics of Central America and the Caribbean are completely overshadowed by the United States. This is not a matter of design on either side; geographical, economic and political circumstances have just made it so, and it cannot reasonably be changed.

Inter-American Politics

There are also international problems on the west coast and in northern South America: latent hostility between Ecuador and Peru; Chilean suspicion of perennial Bolivian demands (last voiced at San Francisco) for a Pacific seaport; renewed—although probably futile—discussion of the possibility of forming a Bolivarian union, consisting of Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador.

But it is at the southern end of the continent that power politics is played most ardently. Imperialistic competition between Argentina and Brazil, which has been going on for years, is now at its height.

Argentine imperialism has been a definite force ever since colonial days; it is not the creation of the present super-nationalistic government. The old viceroyalty of the Rio de le Plata included the territory of Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay, and parts of Brazil, as well as what is now Argentina, and there has always been a school of Argentine thought which advocated re-incorporating this territory in the national domain. Traditional Argentine rivalry with the United States is closely related to this imperialistic urge, for Argentina would like to dominate the southern part of the hemisphere as the United States does the northern.

But Argentina's immediate rival

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is Brazil. Up to the beginning of the war, Argentina had all the best of it. Politically and militarily, it was the king pin of the continent, and its commercial leadership was secure. Paraguay and Bolivia were political and economic battlegrounds for the two powers of South America; but Argentina was far ahead.

The war has changed all that. Argentina's refusal to cooperate with the rest of the hemisphere has hurt Argentina more than the hemisphere. Unable to rearm at a modern pace, discredited in inter-American councils, Buenos Aires has clearly lost its old position. It is not lost irretrievably, perhaps, but there is no sign that Argentine policy will be modified enough to regain the lost ground.

The rulers of Brazil have been more astute. They have played ball with the United States and the United Nations on all occasions, and have, in return, been given every possible assistance. With this aid, Brazil is well on the way to becoming a modern, industrialized country, able to aspire the role of a Middle Power. Its army, navy and air force have been built up by the United States to a point where it would probably be more than a match for Argentina. The balance of power in South America has been completely upset. And just because it has been upset, it is more of an issue than ever.

This very sketchy picture of the power position of the South American countries suggests how unlikely a unified and permanent Latin American bloc is; just as unlikely as a united hemisphere behind the United States. The fear of those who foresee these things seem somewhat exaggerated.

This can be told now that the war is over in Europe. Shortly after the Allied invasion of France, some of our troops got bogged down by snow in the Ardennes sector. It became more difficult to get supplies to our troops and the commanding officer sent a top secret message to the Eastern Defense Command to rush 150 Eskimo dogs. The dogs were purchased in Canada and sent to the Air Transport base in Maine. The officer there sent this wire to the big air base in Scotland: "Shipping 150 Eskimo dogs fastest." The wire told on which plane they were being sent. The officers in charge of the Scotland base were flabbergasted by the message. Surely, they thought, no Eskimo dogs were actually being flown to Scotland. Everybody agreed.

One officer read and reread the wire. "I get it," he said. "This is written in code." So they all got out the code book and tried to decipher. Somehow, they interpreted the message to mean that Roosevelt was flying to meet Churchill and Stalin at a Big Three meeting. Orders were given to clean up the place. Men had to wash and press their clothes and shine their shoes. The whole Army contingent at the base was in apple-pie order and its members were standing stiffly at attention as the big plane landed. The band struck up "Hail to the Chief," as the doors of the plane opened. Everyone was on time to greet the President. But out walked the 150 Eskimo dogs. This story has an anti-climactic angle, too; the snow in the Ardennes had melted before the dogs arrived.

—Jerry Klutz in the Washington Post

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Outcasts: Russia and Germany

By Frederick H. Cramer
Department of History, Mount Holyoke College

● The story of German-Russian relations between the two world wars of our century is largely the account of the relations between the Soviet regime and three utterly different German regimes: the imperial regime of William II which ended in November, 1918, the democratic Germany of the Weimar Republic (1918-1933), and Hitler's Nazi Germany. (1933-1945). Each of these three periods produced its German-Russian treaties in which the spirit, true or feigned, of the respective partners towards each other was mirrored. The imperial Germany of William II was to a certain extent midwife to the nascent Communist Russia. It shipped Lenin with a safe-conduct from his Swiss exile through Germany in the midst of World War I in order to drive Russia out of the war and into a separate peace by means of internal collapse. A brilliant idea, but one which backfired with catastrophic results.

In October-November, 1917, Ludendorff's "protégé" Lenin succeeded at last in overthrowing the feeble liberal-democratic provisional regime which in turn had previously dethroned Czar Nicholas II. Since one of the most effective slogans of the victorious Communists had been the cry "An end to the imperialist war!", they were obliged to enter at once into peace negotiations with Germany and the other Central Powers. On December 22, 1917, at Brest-Litovsk, the bespangled generals and bemedaled civilian representatives of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey opened formal negotiations with a drab looking Soviet representative by the name of Leon Trotsky. Since the new Russian regime was willing to conclude peace at any price, the victor's claims were exhorbitant. The fiery Trotsky rebelled when confronted (Dec. 28, 1917) with demands for Russian acceptance of the independence of Finland, Poland and the Baltic states, i.e., Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia. His objections produced only additional demands. On January 8, 1918, the Central Powers also insisted upon the setting up of an independent Ukraine. Eventually, Trotsky broke off negotiations (February 10) and advised Lenin to offer a Ghandi-like non-resistance, if the German Armies plunged into Russia.

Lenin, however, refused to be swayed by patriotic sentimentality. In Trotsky's place he sent Chicherin, an aristocrat turned Communist, to offer what amounted to unconditional surrender on the part of red Russia. Chicherin arrived at Brest-Litovsk to re-open the negotiations on February 28. Three days later (!), March 3,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1918, the treaty was signed. It was ratified on March 16 by the Congress of Soviets, despite some desperate behind the scenes maneuvers of Trotsky. There is, however, some poetic justice in the fact that Trotsky, the future victim of a Communist fanatic's ice-pick murder, not long after the treaty of Brest-Litovsk became the founder of the new world-famous Red Army, destined to reverse the debacle of Brest-Litovsk.

The main principle on which the treaty was based by the victors was that of a *cordon sanitaire*, i.e., a belt of buffer states between the menacing red volcano and the presumably still quiescent social and political world of central Europe. Chicherin had signed away all territories demanded, among which the Ukraine was the first whose puppet government placed itself under German suzerainty by special treaty. An "independent" Poland had already been established in November, 1915, by Germany and Austria. It now became the central pivot of the whole system of buffer states which, for practical purposes, was considered a German sphere of influence. The other clauses of the treaty proved more or less ephemeral, but two elements inherent in it became of considerable importance: the idea of the *cordon sanitaire*, and the fact that a number of European states, in accepting its signature on the treaty, actually had recognized the Communist regime whose chances for survival at the time heavily discounted almost everywhere, even among the victors of Brest-Litovsk.

The collapse of the Central Powers in the fall of 1918 seemed at first to benefit Russia. A prostrate Germany could no longer hope to "protect" its buffer states. The thorn deepest in the flesh of Russia, the independent Ukraine, was the first of these to succumb to Soviet Russia. The recovery of the other areas lost at Brest-Litovsk must now be considered as one of the basic aims of Russian foreign policy between the two world wars. The only effort, however, to effect this by violence was, except for the reconquest of the Ukraine, the Russo-Polish war of 1920-21. And even this was begun in defense of Russian territory (including the Ukraine) against Polish attempts to restore the eastern borders of old Poland, first partitioned in 1772. After initial successes the still loosely coordinated Red Armies were routed and, in the peace of Riga (1921), Lenin abandoned the premature project.

Nevertheless, the *cordon sanitaire* (minus the Urkaine) would never have survived until 1939-40, had not the western allies taken those buffer states under their protective wing, when the Germany of William II fell in 1918. The Treaty of Versailles made Germany formally renounce the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk which the western powers had never recognized anyaway. One must marvel at the fact that the chief territorial changes, effected by that void (or voided) treaty were nevertheless vigorously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defended by the western powers, their moral justification being the principle of the self-determination of nations. This as applied to the Esths, Lets, Lithuanians, Finns and Poles, seemed to cover the allied policies with an adequate coating of morality.

The Weimar Republic, which succeeded willy-nilly to the mess which William II had left behind him, found itself in an anomalous position. The abrogation of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk by the Versailles Treaty and the sanguinary suppression of numerous Communist risings in Germany left the two countries in a somewhat suspended state of diplomatic and economic animation. The German defeat of 1918 and the subsequent years of international isolation, on the other hand, tended to put Germany and Russia into a category by themselves, i.e., that of two major European powers in eclipse. Not until 1922 were they—both for the first time after World War I—invited to sit again in the international councils of Europe at a meeting convened at Genoa in the spring of that year. The western powers, however, still adopted the pose of the victor to such an extent that the German and the Russian delegations began to fear that one of them might be played against the other. The leader of the German representatives was the most brilliant statesman Germany has produced since Bismarck, but in contrast to the Iron Chancellor a firm believer in democracy, international collaboration and the peaceful settlement of all disputes between nations. Head of one of the world's greatest electro-trusts, the A. E. G., a multi-millionaire, Rathenau, then Foreign Minister of the Weimar Republic, was at the same time a profound writer on philosophical and sociological topics.

His Russian counterpart at Genoa was Chickerin, he who barely four years ago, had signed Russia's unconditional surrender to Germany and the other Central Powers. The democratic multi-millionaire and the aristocratic Communist decided at Genoa to conclude long pending German-Russian negotiations by signing of a treaty. They did this at a resort near Genoa, whence the resulting treaty bears the name of the Treaty of Rapallo (April 16, 1922). It was a bombshell, in spite of the fact that it contained no clauses of a military nature. It did, however, not only re-establish full diplomatic relations between the Germany of Weimar and Soviet Russia, but also eliminated the noxious debt question. The most important clause contained a firm declaration of German-Russian friendship. Shunned by the western victors, the two major powers had at least joined a common dog-house.

Rathenau did not live to see the important diplomatic and economic consequences of this treaty which became the basis for German-Russian relations until 1941. A Jew, he was assassinated a few week later (June 24, 1922) by young German fanatics Nazi type.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The diplomatic repercussions of the new German-Russian pact benefitted both partners. Fear of a hostile German-Russian bloc helped to mitigate the attitude of the western powers against the two countries. For Germany the Dawes Agreement (1924), the Locarno Pact (1925) and the entry into the League of Nations as a permanent council member (1926) were among the fruits reaped by Rathenau's unprepossessing political heir Stresemann. Similarly, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, not to mention a number of smaller states, began to see their way to the official recognition of Soviet Russia (between February 1, 1924 and Jan. 1, 1925).

In appreciation of Russian fears that Germany's increasingly close relations with the western powers, established in those years (1924-1926), might alienate her from Russia, Stresemann balanced his western commitments by a friendship treaty concluded with Russia at Berlin. (April, 1926). This treaty remained the formal basis of German-Russian relations until Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union in June, 1941, but actually, it was only a renewal of the Rapallo treaty. It proclaimed German-Russian friendship for a period of five years at least; i.e., unless renewed it would expire in 1931.

Meanwhile, the direct economic benefits of the Rapallo treaty had become perhaps even more important to the two partners than its indirect diplomatic consequences. By underwriting large orders given by the Soviet government to German industries, the Weimar Republic assured the German manufacturers that they ran no vital risk in signing contracts with the representatives from Moscow. Enormous quantities of German machinery and other industrial products were shipped to Russia, frequently accompanied by skeleton crews of engineers and skilled workmen to set up factories in Russia, to run the equipment and, most important of all, to teach masses of Russian workmen and engineers how to handle, and even how to build such apparatus. Far less innocent than these financially profitable transactions, however, were the concomitant activities of a military nature. Actually, the disarmed Germany of the Weimar period became the chief foreign adviser of the rising Red Army. Among the factories established deep inside Russia with German equipment and staffed by German technicians and workers were airplane and tank producing plants, as well as a host of other military industries banned from Germany by the winners of World War I, but flourishing now deep inside impenetrable red Russia. Apart from thus assisting in the building up of Russia's industrial war potential, Germany also provided trained experts to instruct the Red Army in the handling of these modern weapons in the field. German officers and military experts established the most intimate and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cordial personal contacts with a large number of ranking Russian army men, regardless of their supposedly diametrically opposed social and political views.

These pleasant diplomatic, economic, and military German-Russian relations of the 'twenties were soon subjected to a severe strain. The worldwide economic depression beginning in 1929 plunged Germany into deep misery. The majority of the Germans saw only an alternative between totalitarian Communism and totalitarian Nazism, when the inept "leaders" of the democratic elements failed utterly to solve the desperate problems raised by the crisis; the great majority of the German voters veered towards one or the other form of totalitarianism, with the Nazis getting the benefit of a far larger increase of adherents than the Communist party. The larger the ranks of the Nazis became in Reichstag (beginning in 1930) the more timid became the last nominal leaders of the democratic republic. Against the hoarse anti-Communist tirades of Hitler and his henchmen, as early as 1931 the formalist Breuning did not dare to discuss a renewal of the expiring German-Russian friendship treaty of Berlin. The treaty lapsed.

That trying to out-nazi the Nazis could save the Weimer republic was of course a ridiculous idea. In January, 1933, Hitler became chancellor and soon showed the world that things had changed in Germany. His first main aim was of course re-armament to the teeth. Serious obstacles could be thrown into his pathway by the western powers. Josef Stalin, Lenin's successor at the helm of the Soviet Union, knew at least enough of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* to realize that sooner or later a re-armed Germany would try to kill two birds with one stone by invading Russia and simultaneously destroying the hated Red regime. Busily occupied with his second five-year plan, however, Stalin also knew that each year would bring Russia nearer to industrial parity and thus aid her in defeating a foreign invasion. Pride and other noble sentiments had to give way before these considerations. Hitler, on the other hand, was fully aware that the western powers expected him to get into trouble with Communist Russia. To show them that he could very well keep his peace with Stalin and turn his enmity into a westerly direction instead, he invited the Russians to discuss a renewal of the expired German-Russian friendship treaty of Berlin. On May 5, 1933, the incredible happened. A new friendship treaty was concluded at Berlin between Hitler and Stalin. It was patterned along the lines of the 1926 treaty. Basically it went back to the Rapallo agreement evolved by a Jew. Hitler in Rathenau's footsteps, an irony only reality could produce!

Understandably, however, Stalin was not fool enough to gamble on the impossible, i.e., on Hitler's adhesion to a signed pledge. He decided to seek a more intensive rap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prochement with the western powers. A Franco-Russian agreement was drafted (1933) and implemented by a military alliance in 1935. The Franco-Russian pact of 1933 was ratified after interminable delays, mainly caused by Laval, in 1936. In the meantime, Aloph Hitler had walked out of the League of Nations (1933), and Josef Stalin had walked in (1934). The growing rift between Germany and Russia became even more apparent during the Spanish civil war (1936-1939). For the first time German "volunteer" fliers fought Soviet Russian "volunteer" fliers on Spanish soil. Russian tanks and their crews appeared in Spain, to be opposed by the Italian "volunteers" of Hitler's latest henchman, Mussolini. A major showdown between Russia and Germany was, however, avoided at this time, largely, because the Spanish loyalist government refused to surrender its powers unconditionally to a Moscow-directed Communist regime. Stalin lost interest and withdrew from the Spanish conflict.

This episode tended to revive reactionary hopes all over western Europe to the effect that a German-Russian conflict was fast approaching, a mood strengthened by the web of Anti-Comintern Pacts with which Hitler skillfully now began to surround Russia. Officially directed solely against Communist activities outside Russia, these pacts actually drew together a formidable looking anti-Russian group in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of World War II. By 1939 such countries as Italy, Japan, Spain, Hungary and others had joined Germany in a common anti-comintern front.

Firmly convinced that nothing would prevent a war of Hitler's making, the western powers, especially France and England, entertained at least some unofficial but powerfully placed hopes to deflect Hitler's lightning from the west towards the east. The Munich agreement (Sept. 1938) partitioned Russia's ally Czechoslovakia without any consultations with Russia. The 25-year Anglo-German friendship pact with which Chamberlain returned from Munich bringing "peace in our time" must have seemed to the Russians the green light given by the western powers for a German-Russian war. This was a misconception, but it died hard. When in the summer of 1939 anxious French and English missions to Moscow tried to secure Russia's alliance for the impending showdown, Stalin decided to assure Russian security and drive a hard bargain. Hitler, on the other hand, had decided to postpone his anti-Communist crusade until after the annihilation of the western powers. He therefore began to outbid France and England at the Kremlin. What Stalin evidently demanded was the return of most of the areas lost at Brest-Litovsk. They were to be returned either outright, or to have at least "friendly governments," a policy to which Stalin has ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hered steadfastly since then, and, with growing success, even extended it to countries never under the sceptre of the Romanovs.

The western powers were not ready to abandon their eastern buffer state fledglings. This may have been partly a matter of prestige, and partly a matter of political considerations. At any rate, Hitler seems to have been the only one at the time to promise Stalin all that the Russian asked. This meant not only the re-incorporation of the Baltic countries, but, as the future revealed, even the withdrawal of the powerfully entrenched German minorities which had lived there since the 13th century. The eastern half of the Poland of 1921, as well as Bessarabia's return were in all probability also granted to Stalin by Hitler as early as 1939. After all, Adolf was always generous with other people's territories.

Thereupon, Stalin decided to stand pat and to watch the approaching duel between Hitler and the western powers. "The plague on both your houses" is a sentiment not entirely confined to Shakespearean characters. The visible and audible signal for Hitler to begin World War II came from Moscow on August 23, 1939, in the form of a renewal of the German-Russian friendship pact. The gist of this brief document deserves to be quoted: (*New York Times*, Aug. 24, 1939):

> "The German Reich government and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics moved by a desire to strengthen the state of peace between Germany and the U. S. S. R. and in the spirit of the provisions of the friendship treaty of April, 1926 (!!) between Germany and the U. S. R. R., decided the following:
>
> Art. I: The two contracting parties obligate themselves to refrain from every act of force, every aggression and every attack against one another, including any single action or that taken in conjunction with other powers.

(The value of this German pledge was forcefully driven home on June 20, 1941!)

> Art II: In case one of the parties of this treaty should become the object of warlike acts by a third power, the other party will in no way support this third power.

(This came into play on Sept. 3, 1939 when the governments of France and England declared that a state of war existed between them and Germany, which, technically, had indeed not yet attacked either power.)

> Art. III: The governments of the two contracting parties in the future will remain constantly in constantly in consultation with one another regarding questions of common interest.
>
> Art. IV: Neither of the contracting parties will associate itself with any other grouping of powers which directly or indirectly is aimed at the other party.

(There was no indication, nevertheless, that Hitler actually abandoned his Anti-Comintern pacts, although these were certainly at least indirectly aimed at Russia. Still, Art. IV represented at least a Russian diplomatic victory.)

> Art. V: In the event of conflict between the contracting parties, concerning any question, the two par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties will adjust this difference or conflict exclusively by friendly exchange of opinions or, if necessary by an arbitration commission.

(The convenient meeting place of such a commission was apparently found at Stalingrad, in the winter of 1942-3.)

Art. VI: The present treaty will extend for a period of ten years [*sic!*] with the condition that if neither of the contracting parties announces its abrogation within one year of expiration of this period, it will continue automatically for another period of five years.

This treaty has been the last formal German-Russian friendship treaty published. Its infamous breach by Hitler has led to the disappearance of a German government capable of concluding any treaties with anyone. At Potsdam, Stalin came to make decisive arrangements concerning Germany with a Briton and an American. No German representative was even present. Looking back across the period between the two world wars, one discerns the making of a tragedy in the development of German-Russian relations. At the beginning stands the blunt and brutal dictate of Brest-Litovsk by a victory-drunk imperial Germany. Then follows the democratic German interlude, producing the friendly and profitable German-Russian relations of the 'twenties, based upon the treaties of Rapallo and Berlin. With the advent of Hitler this reality becomes a deadly facade for sinister Nazi plotting and scheming. The two German-Russian friendship treaties of 1933 and 1939 characterize this ebbing and dying of German-Russian amity. At the very end of the road looms the fall of Berlin (May 2, 1945) and the unconditional surrender of Germany to Russia and her allies. From Brest-Litovsk to Potsdam, what a reversal in the respective fortunes of the two nations! Nothing, perhaps, could be a more bitter and yet a more salutary lesson to the German people!

* * *

Try It Out:

Take your house number and double it. Add 5. Multiply by half a hundred. Then add your age (no cheating). Add the number of days in a year. Subtract 615; the last two figures will be your age; the others your house number.

—*Savannah Rotary, Savannah, Georgia*

* * *

Pay Your Money and Take Your Choice:

"Atrocity Films Shake German Prisoners Here."

—*Headline in the New York Herald Tribune*

"Germans Are Unmoved by Atrocity Film."

—*Headline same day in the New York Times*

* * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wood and the World

By John Maguire

Now that peace is here, will the world have enough wood?

In postwar days, vast quantities of lumber will be needed to rebuild the world's shattered cities, particularly in Europe, and to supply the normal construction demands which have been dammed up during the war years. Large amounts of wood pulp will also be vital to restoration of peacetime economic prosperity in almost every nation.

How great the global need for wood will be cannot be accurately foretold, but it will be tremendous. Authoritative estimates from England indicate Britain's reconstruction program will require from four to six billion board feet of softwood lumber a year *for ten years!* This figure is for lumber alone, and does not include chemical wood pulp or other forms of cellulose. Most of Europe will be in similar straits.

Where is the wood coming from?

Overcutting has severely damaged the forests of France; the limited timberlands of Belgium and the Netherlands have been despoiled by war; Italy is almost devoid of timber. England has been forced to harvest many of her ancient, historic shade trees, so deeply has she cut into her forests, and Germany's woodlands, under Hitler, have been badly over-logged. Former wood-exporting nations, like Yugoslavia, Poland, Finland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Austria, may be unable to meet even their own postwar needs.

Of the "have" nations of Europe, Sweden is well equipped for immediate export, having accumulated large stockpiles of lumber and wood pulp—600,000 tons of the latter commodity. Norway's forests are in fair condition, but the Nazis are said to have mined her sawmills and pulp mills, and are expected to cripple her production facilities when they leave the country.

Finland, normally an exporter, has lost many mills to Russia through cession. Her remaining mills are reported to be in poor operating condition. In addition, reparations of three hundred million dollars to Russia during the next six years are expected to be made largely in wood pulp, which reduces Finland's export possibilities still further, so far as the general market is concerned.

From the standpoint of available timber supply, Russia is the most favored nation in Europe. Nazi Armies have surged back and forth across her land, but she still retains the world's greatest forest area, in comparatively good condition. Before the war, Russia had an estimated annual new wood growth of 22 billion cubic feet on her 2½ million square miles of forest land—an area larger than the rest of Europe. Her annual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut was estimated at eight billion feet, slightly more than one-third of her yearly growth. Russia at that time cut for export about 500,000 trees annually, but this was only one per cent of what could safely have been cut without lessening her forest wealth, as Siberia alone had an estimated annual growth of 50 million trees.

Admittedly, Russia's internal need for lumber and pulp will be great but, unique among countries which require rehabilitation, the Soviet Union has enough timberlands to meet her own needs and still supply a large surplus to other lands.

Ordinarily, the United States might be expected to compete strongly for a large portion of the rehabilitation business. But there is an accumulated internal demand in America, mostly for home building and repair, that will probably keep most of our lumber industry going at normal capacity—and the new wartime trends in wood chemistry and technology promise additional peacetime markets for wood. The paper and pulp industry, says the Department of Commerce, will for a while use all the wood they can get—and will still be forced to run at less than capacity because of the tight supply.

Accordingly, the fate of the war-sticken nations appears to depend in large measure on the Soviet Union's action. Will Russia undertake to ship lumber and pulp to her needy neighbors? Or will she supply only her internal demand, and trust that the United States will service most of the rest of the world?

The problem posed is more complex, and more important to this country, than may appear at first glance. Typical of its complexity is the wide range of opinion among American forest operators and foresters as to which choice this country should make: to strive with our usual aggressive technique to obtain all the foreign rehabilitation orders we can handle, or to maintain an aloof attitude and urge—even insist—that our Soviet ally supply her neighbors.

It will not be an easy chore for Russia, if she does decide to export large quantities of wood. Not only will her own need for lumber and pulp be great, but her entire mechanical plant has suffered severely. Manpower and money and machinery will be requisitioned by virtually all her vital industries, and it will not be simple for Soviet rulers to decide which are to be forced to operate at reduced speed until time and increased momentum will permit full operation in all industries.

The fact remains, however, that Russia is the only Old World nation with sufficient natural forest endowments to take on the job. She also possesses reasonably advanced logging equipment and techniques. She *could* export a large share of the wood so badly needed, and at no small advantage. There is a rich trade in lumber and pulp involved in supplying the "have not" nations of Europe. Once Russia got its foot

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the door of this profitable customer, the other timber-exporting countries of the world would find it extremely difficult to regain their former markets.

It has been admitted by Russian writers—and, considering the state of the press in the Soviet, any such admission may be deemed official views—that "our country must inevitably become the main supplier of wood for the whole of Europe . . . . the U.S.S.R. is advancing with great strides toward the fulfillment of this international economic task."

Forest experts have long conceded the probable truth of this opinion. Some have gone further, and assigned to the Soviet eventual leadership on a worldwide basis. Now, however, a new factor has become evident in recent decades: the increasingly rapid spread of greatly improved forest management in the United States, and the re-growth possibilities of our cut-over forests.

In earlier evaluations of the world forest situation, Russia won the nomination as ultimate chief wood-producing nation largely on the basis of the inventory of U. S. old-growth forest, without regard to the reproductive capacity of the land. At the rate our expanding economy was using varied forest products, their effective industrial life seemed limited.

Canada's forest reserves were always huge, of course, but Great Britain and the rest of the United Kingdom are necessarily in preferred position as customers, so that Canadian wood export is discounted somewhat in any study of markets outside the Empire. Brazil, a land of great forests, was not, and is not now, far enough along the road to mechanized production of her wood wealth to enter the export field in the near or middle distance future.

So Russia appears a logical choice as a postwar leader in wood production. Russia's forests will certainly insure her a pre-eminent position in world wood trade, but America will be a potent factor.

It is true that some day, all U. S. "virgin timber" will be harvested, but this does not mean that our forests are gone. With modern, scientific methods of harvesting timber, we can actually *increase* the rate of growth of wood in a forest stand by skillful use of the axe—and we have been doing it on an ever-widening scale for some time.

Today the U. S. Forest Service estimates that effective saw timber growth in American forests is approximately 32 billion board feet annually. This growth is in excess of the annual saw timber harvest in several years since 1930. As mature, growth-static virgin stands are harvested under logling methods which are improving each year, an increase in the amount of new wood created annually can be expected. The U. S. has been taking the lead in the last fifteen years in forest management which seeks successive harvests.

The methods used vary in dif

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferent parts of the country. Selective logging is favored in forests made up of trees of various ages, where older, comparatively unproductive trees may be selected for harvesting. When these mature trees, that grow little or are perhaps nearing a natural death, are removed, growth of younger trees is accelerated. More important may be the fact that new seedlings now have room to take root and grow, in the space formerly occupied by the overmature trees.

Where a forest is composed of even-aged trees, as in the fir stands of the Pacific Northwest, block cutting may be preferred from a forestry standpoint. Here a swath of trees is logged, leaving only low stumps. Intermittent blocks of parent trees left standing in strategic locations scatter seed with a prolific hand. When the cut-over area is thickly carpeted with vigorous young growth, the parent trees are themselves harvested.

With extension of these techniques and with a concerted drive by government and private forest industry to keep fire—Forest Enemy No. 1—out of the woods, America is well along on a period of forest transition in which timber "mining" is giving way to timber "cropping."

Admittedly the war years have placed a heavy burden on forest resources, but if the nation can continue on the path it chose in the years before Pearl Harbor, we can be confident of successive forest harvests. Lyle F. Watts, chief of the U. S. Forest Service, put this confidence into words at the fortieth anniversary celebration of the Forest Service when he said, "But forty years hence the nation will be 'over the hump' in the challenging task of growing timber in sufficient quantities to assure a host of industries an abundant supply of wood."

Improvements in resin glues, wood laminating techniques and timber connectors already make it possible for young trees to take over many of the tasks once certain continuance of progress in wood technology indicates wider utilization possibilities for second growth forests.

In addition, as the world's stands of virgin timber are harvested, the remaining virgin forests become more expensive to log. It may not be economically sound to go deep into the forests of Brazil or Siberia, for instance, to obtain large timber. Logging and transportation costs will be prohibitive—and unnecessary, since the extension of existing silvicultural practices to our cut-over lands will provide sufficient crops of second growth timber in relatively accessible areas within the United States.

Summing up, the best assurance that our American forests will increasingly be managed under good silvicultural practices is that modern forestry is certain to become good business.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Atomic Bomb

By Hanson W. Baldwin
From his column in The New York Times

• The date, Aug. 6, 1945, and the name, Hiroshima, Japan, will long live in the sanguinary history of war.

On that day man unleashed the atom to destroy man, and another chapter in human history opened, a chapter in which the weird, the strange, the horrible becomes the trite and the obvious. At that time we clinched victory in the Pacific, but we sowed the whirlwind.

The dropping on Japan of an atomic energy bomb, developed by frantic and intensive work in secret American laboratories, came as another and by far the greatest step in the campaign of military obliteration and political and psychological ultimatums that started soon after V-E Day.

The broadcasts by Capt. E. M. Zacharias of the Navy, the Potsdam declaration, and the announcements of Japanese cities to be bombed are now followed by a warning forecast of what may have come if enemy resistance continued. We broke the enemy's will to fight without invasion.

The result was unpredictable because the forces unleashed August 6 are outside human experience. The atomic energy explosive now in use in the Pacific is a derivative of uranium, U-235. The bomb dropped—the size of which was not specified—is said to be equivalent in explosive force to 20,000 tons of TNT.

TNT itself has been surpassed in this war by explosives of more devastating force, DRX; Hexonite, Torpex and others. But these later explosives had a bursting effect only 20 to 60 per cent greater than TNT; the atomic explosive is many thousand times more destructive.

The blast effect of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, according to President Truman's announcement, is equivalent to 2,000 times that of the largest bomb now known. One of the largest bombs ever used in war, the British 12,000 pound blockbuster, spreads its blast effect over 16½ acres.

The atomic energy bomb dropped on Hiroshima probably had the same effect, therefore — if the scientists' calculation is correct — as a number of Halifax explosions rolled into one. In Halifax, N. S., on Dec. 6, 1917, 3,000 tons of ammunition aboard a ship in the harbor blew up, killing 1,500 persons, injuring 4,000 and wrecking two and one-half square miles of the city.

The bomb dropped functioned according to calculations and a great part of Hiroshima, a city of 318,000 persons, was destroyed. Man has released unknowable forces.

Exactly what the atomic bomb did and exactly what it can be expected to do, no man can now

Copyright 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say. It has long been known that we were engaged in a race with the Germans and perhaps other nations to develop such a practicable, workable, explosive, and in one sense the blow was only a partially kept secret in that such an attack had been anticipated by some observers.

But the means and methods by which the explosive is developed, its formula, the process of manufacture, of bomb loading and of detonation are all carefully guarded secrets, known in their entirety to only a few men. Nor can the bomb's effects be stated. But it is probable that in addition to the direct destructive effects of the blast —terrific in their consequences— there are secondary, and perhaps later effects. Those within a certain radius who escape death may be marred or maimed, blinded, deafened, diseased.

It is probable that the Japanese, as well as the Germans, were working intensively on the development of atomic energy explosives, for we now know that liaison between the Germans and the Japanese was considerably closer than we once believed. But it is unlikely that Japanese scientists had solved the problem. Even if they had, they lost the lethal race, for Japanese industries and productive facilities were in no sense a match for our own, and Japan had virtually no means—with her air power and her navy so clearly outmatched—to launch atomic energy upon this country.

The dropping of the bomb was accompanied and followed by an unprecedented "war of words"; our psychological warfare agencies went "all out" in attempts to persuade Japan that she must surrender quickly or be destroyed.

In war—particularly this war—it is almost useless to talk of the "rules" of war. And quite clearly our development of an atomic explosive was in the nature of a race for survival. Its use probably saved American lives, shortened the war materially, even compelled Japanese surrender.

Yet when this is said, we have sowed the whirlwind. Much of our bombing throughout this war—like the enemy's—has been directed against cities, and hence against civilians. Because our bombing has been more effective and hence more devastating, Americans have become a synonym for destruction. And now we have been the first to introduce a new weapon of unknowable effects which brought us victory quickly but which will sow the seeds of hate more widely than ever. We may yet reap the whirlwind.

Certainly with such God-like power under man's imperfect control we face a frightful responsibility. Atomic energy may well lead to a bright new world in which man shares a common brotherhood, or we shall become —beneath the bombs and rockets—a world of troglodytes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Education or Book Burning

By Dorothy Thompson

From her column "On the Record" in The Portland Press-Herald

• We have begun a program of German re-education, both in the prison camps and in Germany. But it is without clarity of aim, and therefore negative, or off the point.

Half a dozen leading American universities have collaborated on the prisoner of war program without answering the primary question: What for?

A review of the courses, as described at some length in *The New York Times*, would seem to indicate that we are grooming German prisoners to become American citizens! They are to study English, the most popular course; American geography, history, and social institutions. Nothing is to be taught that does not deal with the American way of life. Why? The courses might turn out to have been excellent training for future German spies.

If our idea is to create German citizens with American ideas of government, then we must show the connection between Jeffersonian and Lincolnian ideas and concepts that have found expression in Germany. What the German prisoner who must return home is thinking about is a future German way of life. If he becomes indoctrinated with American principles, and applies them to his own country, he will find them incompatible with the system of military government which Americans have set up there. Just as the English philosophers of freedom were the teachers of the American rebels who rose against British rule, so American government principles, if digested by Germans, would logically create rebellions.

The Russians have thought more practically. Their prisoner of war re-education has consisted of fostering German political movements, German publications, and German discussions in the camps, chiefly under the guidance of exiled German Communists, who, shortly after the Russian armies moved into Germany, returned and are now addressing Communist gatherings, in the only occupational zone where political assemblies are permitted, namely the Russian.

There must always be a connection between education and life's realities. If a German prisoner becomes inflamed with admiration for the American Bill of Rights, he is certain to demand civil liberties in his own land, where not a single one of them exists under the occupation armies. Communism is not incompatible with Moscow's discipline and authority, but liberal democracy is incompatible with ours. Ah, there's the rub!

The Institute for the Re-Education of Germans has decided that we must make unavailable to the Germans "all books glorifying war." I hope we have thought that one through, but I am afraid not.

Are we to copy Hitler's book

Copyright 1945, by Bell Syndicate, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burnings? Are we to turn over to a commission authority to raid German libraries under some general and dubious directives?

The German prisoner of war, indoctrinated with the American way of life, will want to know how Americans are applying the principles of freedom of speech and of the press, when they hear of this.

It is impossible to suppress all books glorifying war without suppressing the Old Testament; the leading classics (Homer, Virgil, Caesar); parts of Shakespeare; all the great body of English, American and German poets who wrote in praise of the struggles for freedom—Byron, Shelley, Whitman, Schiller, for instance; Marx Engels, and the Communist writers who preached the class struggle; the histories of the British, French, American and Russian revolutions (many of these suppressed by Hitler); and, in fact, most of the existing histories of the last 2,000 years, and almost everything, written in any country, during these war years, including speeches of Churchill, Stalin and FDR; most American films; many American comics, and the speeches of General Patton.

Ironically enough, it would be possible to keep most of the published speeches of Hitler, for he consistently took the line that the struggle was forced upon Germany by the wicked warmongers of the democracies, who interfered with Germany's peaceable mission to spread The New Order and German culture.

Whatever measures we take to suppress books will, I suppose, be carried out by military authorities. I imagine a conversation between—let us say—four-year-old Hans and his mother.

Hans: Mama, what are those men doing?

Mother: They are removing dangerous books that might fill your mind with war.

Hans: And why do they wear such beautiful clothes with brass buttons?

Mother: Because they are soldiers.

Hans: What are soldiers, Mama?

Mother: (for the sake of the argument) People, dear, who make peace.

Hans: Mama, I want to have a suit like that and make peace. Where can I read about soldiers?

Excuse me, while I go out and have a nervous breakdown.

It is possible that we can contribute to education for a free, democratic, and peaceful Germany, but not if, at the same time, we want a subservient, foreign-educated military-controlled Germany. The latter requires education in blind obedience. To say the one and do the other is hypocrisy. And since all real education is a search after truth, the intelligent German will at once see the disparities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Life on Loo-Choo

By Malcolm W. Bingay

From his column "Good Morning" in The Detroit Free Press

• Now that we have captured Okinawa it might be well to know what we've taken hold of. The other night I went through the encyclopedias and I now pass on to you, my ever faithful, some of the more interesting items.

Okinawa is the largest of a chain of 55 islands which are inhabited by natives so gentle and courteous that the Chinese once called this ancient Kingdom of Loo-Choo, "Land of Propriety."

Loo-Choo (also known as Luchu, Liu-Kiu, Liu-Chiu, Riu-Kiu and Ryukyus, just to let you know I've been studying) became known to the Chinese in the year 610. The people were treated very decently. but the dirty Japs began horning in about 1451 and by 1879 had taken possession.

The people are about a thousand years behind the march of what we call civilization. They had no idea there was any war on and paid no attention to Japanese military preparedness. None of their business.

So when the American Marines swept overland and Yankee planes danced in the air they must have felt a lot like we did in the United States when Orson Welles scared the dickens out of us some years ago by announcing that an army from Mars had launched an invasion.

War correspondents tell us about the plentifulness of pigs on the island and what fun the boys have had shooting them for food. But it says right here in the book that, by some ancient tribal religious custom, every family must own at least four pigs.

So the natives no doubt do not think it fun at all to see their pigs being made into porkchops by these strange visitors.

While Buddhism and Shintoism and some Christianity is to be found on the islands—population about half a million—religion has been allowed to slip back pretty much into tribal customs.

Part of this is a curious burial system. Tombs are built on the sides of the hills on every farm and are shaped like horseshoes. The dead man is rolled up into a ball and tucked into this tomb. The idea is that as he lived before he was born so should he rest in death. After a few years of this, when there is nothing left but the skeleton, the bones are cleansed with sake—a kind of beer—and put in urns. The tomb is then ready for the next one.

There used to be a very venomous snake on the islands called habu. They are now pretty well cleaned out of Okinawa but are still to be found on the smaller uninhabited islands.

While the "upper classes" of Loo-Choo and the Japs closely resemble each other the lower classes remain native and do not

Copyright 1945, by The Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resemble the enemy at all. While shorter they are better proportioned and have fine, intelligent faces.

Also they are hairy, which gives rise to the theory that they are descendants of the Ainu who were conquered by the Japs.

Women of the upper classes in Loo-Choo never appear in public and are never even alluded to in conversation, but the women of the lower classes go about freely and are much taller and stronger than the men—doing most of the work.

At Naha, the capital city, there is a night-club section where cafe society gathers for fun. Here the tired business man of the upper classes enjoys life with the geisha girls in the theaters, restaurants and other hot spots. As no gentleman of the upper classes ever admits ever having a wife there are never any of these embarrassing incidents so frequently reported by our gossip-column press of the United States.

A hedonistic native of Loo-Choo can make out a pretty fair argument for the life he leads. That is, the better classes who can afford such a life. He will argue that he has to have some fun because he doesn't live very long.

The wretched food and the dampness, the poor water supply and the lack of sanitation, with the monsoons and the typhoons, all combine to make a dreary life of it. Although there is an almost constant water fall the chloride content is so high that it is little better than sea water.

All this brings on a terrific death rate among the adolescents and a short span of life even to the healthiest.

The winds do not permit it to become a tropical country and it gets cold there at night. The houses are surrounded with trees and shrubbery to keep out the raw night air and to protect the dwellings from the typhoons.

The houses have no furniture, the family squatting on the floors. Each owner of a little farm has a horse or a cow or a goat, a few chickens and pigs. Plenty of pigs.

Since the Americans have taken over the natives have not only become reconciled to the new order but are enthusiastic about it. They even approve of the Yankee idea of sanitation and look upon our machinery as some weird visitation from some place they have vaguely heard about as heaven.

* * *

● "Ickes To Give Europe Coal."

—*Headline in The New York Times*

"Ickes Won't Send Coal To Europe."

—*Headline same day in The New York Herald Tribune*

* * *

● An overheard remark made by a sailor taking his first wartime ride on a crowded subway: "Gee, ain't there any escape hatches in this thing?"

—*Quote*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who Will Put the Pieces Together?

By Anne O'Hare McCormick
From her column "Abroad" in The New York Times

● For a long time "too little and too late" was the key phrase in a bitter chronicle. It ran through the reports of lost battles like the chorus of a Greek tragedy—the lament of the victims of aggression for their unpreparedness for war. And now, on the Continent where the battles are won, it begins to dawn on the victors that the old cry may rise again, this time as a lament over our unpreparedness for peace.

Today's bad news is not of setbacks on the fighting front; Japan reeled under knockout blows as blindly and fatally as Germany did early this year. It is not of disagreement among the major Allies; there is every reason to hope that the Big Three are working together to fulfill the awful responsibility they have assumed as the supreme negotiators for the human race.

The sad news is that the struggle does not end. In the days of "too little and too late" a lot of people used to question whether democracies could organize themselves to wage total war. Now that we know the answer to that one, the next question is: Can the powers that won the war win the peace? Logic replies that if they are capable of passing the first test they can pass the second. But it becomes increasingly clear that those who kept saying that the second job would be harder and longer than the first were not talking rhetoric.

In three months the smoke of battle has cleared away and we have seen Europe, not as we dreamed of it in the five years when it was shut away—filled with people who were following our thoughts and watching our slow preparations for deliverance; not as it appeared when at last it became the battlefield and everything was again hidden under the dust of moving armies and the rain of bomb fire—but Europe as it is, exhausted, divided, ravaged, hungry and reckless.

It has suddenly been brought home to Americans that this Europe is not only a charge upon us but a danger. The boys who fought there are coming back, shipload after shipload, division after division. The bands play when they land and our creaking transportation system, overstrained by the long drag to carry the goods that rolled down the Red Ball highways to the front, does its best—an apologetic second best—to get them home quickly. They are an excited lot, returning from a world farther away from this than any ocean can bridge. They are a little dazed at finding things so much "the same," and perhaps at finding themselves not quite the same in the old surroundings. For most of them homecoming is only a furlough between stations, and this puts restraints upon

Copyright 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their exuberance—this, and the haunting feeling that what they have left behind is not peace. "We've broken it up all right," said a veteran of 23 who landed a few days ago. "But I've been wondering all the way home who's going to put the pieces together."

It is becoming plain that the San Francisco Charter cannot make peace. Even the Big Three cannot make peace, though if they agree on the principles and conditions they can certainly prevent war. Peace cannot even be imposed, much less built, on misery and despair. We have fought a terrible war for Europe, but we will not win it until the elemental needs, bread, work and stability, are satisfied.

The trouble with Europe is that it needs everything. What Secretary Ickes called "the race between coal and anarchy" will not be won by the War Department's decision to send 2,605 German war prisoners back "in six weeks" to work in the German coal mines. It's too little, too late. The Ruhr mines are producing less than 10 per cent of their normal output, not mainly because of lack of workers but because many mines are unworkable, because housing is destroyed throughout the district and because here, as in France and Belgium, the miners have to have food to be able to work. It will take 200 times 2,000 war prisoners to work the German mines. It will take all the workers that can be recruited for the French and Belgian mines. It will take at least a double food ration (which the Germans gave the miners) to make them work effectively. It will take railroads and locomotives and coal cars to carry the coal where it is needed. It will take an agreement with the Russians to get some of the product of the Silesian mines.

With all that there will be nothing like enough coal to start the wheels of Europe turning, let alone to heat the houses of the population. There will not be enough if the 6,000,000 tons Mr. Ickes proposes to send from here are added, though that might swing the balance between order and disorder, life and death.

Europe needs everything—but only to start going. In calculating how much we stand to lose if the continent we sacrificed so much to save sinks into chaos, we cannot afford to forget that for five years Germany drew only on the resources of Europe to hold the world at bay. She had no other reservoir to supply her insatiable war machine and feed 300,000,000 people. Small compared to other continents, Europe is rich in natural resources, in skill, labor and intelligence. In straining ourselves to put this continent on the way to reconstruction, we gain more than we lose: not only markets, not only stability where stability most affects us, but our best chance to extend the zone of freedom on which our own freedom depends. A chance, in other words, to win the war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Front

VICTORY

On August 14, the Japanese Empire surrendered unconditionally to the United States and her Allies. The announcement climaxed a week of mounting tension, of false rumors and of premature peace celebrations. The peoples of the world stood anxiously by as the involved machinery of diplomatic protocol was set in motion. The momentous news finally came, at 7:00 p.m. (E.W.T.), when the Japanese acceptance of our ultimatum was transmitted through the Swiss government. The Japanese note accepted our terms and bowed to the inevitable—the Emperor was to be under the control of an American Commander in Chief. There was little doubt in anyone's mind as to who that man would be. General Douglas MacArthur who had directed Allied forces in the Pacific for three and a half years, was the logical choice.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Thus ended the most destructive war in history, hastened by our discovery of the most destructive weapon known to mankind.

The international news of the month, second only to the coming of peace, is unquestionably the development and use of the atomic bomb. A new destructive weapon, so much more powerful than anything ever used before, it may well force the formation of a world peace organization more powerful and more genuinely dedicated to the preservation of peace than any we have known.

In the post war years it is quite likely that a group of competent scientists may develop a better process for the splitting of atoms, "better" in the sense of less expensive and more destructive. When this is accomplished, the United Nations Charter may prove to be as inadequate to cope with the preservation of civilization as were the anti-aircraft defenses of Hiroshima against the basic forces of the universe.

THE POTSDAM COMMUNIQUE

The news blackout on the problems discussed by the Big Three at Potsdam came to an end on August 2, when a joint communique, signed by J. V. Stalin, Harry S. Truman and C. R. Attlee, was issued. Never, claimed the correspondents, had so many men traveled so far for so little news. From July 16 on, we learned much about uniforms — Generalissimo Statlin still seems to like them fancy; luncheons — President Truman ate two in one day; but nothing about the problems that the "Big Three" were discussing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fact, the British and American heads of delegations to Potsdam knew that the biggest peace news would be, not the plans announced there, but the effect of the atomic bomb to be dropped on Japan on August 6.

For obvious reasons this news was kept, not only from the correspondents, but from most of the delegates, including even a large part of the British and American delegations. The dramatic interruption of the conference to send an aultimatum to Japan, important as it seemed, took on added significance after the announcement of the dropping of the bomb.

For a second time, the conference was interrupted to permit Churchill and Attlee to return to England to get the election results.

The communique did not discuss the war in the Pacific. It merely announced that the Chiefs of Staff held a meeting on "military matters of common interest."

Primarily, it was concerned with the future of Germany, and indicated clearly that there had been little compromise with advocates of a "soft" peace. Once Germany is decentralized, politically and economically, she will be forced to work toward a "democratic and peaceful" basis on a standard of living "not exceeding" that of other European countries.

A formula for German reparations based, not on cash payments, but on the removal of capital equipment, war materials and finished products from defeated Germany, was evolved. Each of the occupying powers will fill its own claims, drawing upon products and equipment in its own zone of occupation. In addition, as flat payment, Russia will receive ten per cent of all removable industrial equipment in the western areas and an extra 15 per cent for which she will pay in goods. The western Allies' claim to the captured gold is to be respected.

Details of principles to be employed in the economic and political control of Germany in the initial period take up the main body of the communique. Since this is only a preliminary plan, the authors have been careful to add that the final settlement will be designed "to convince the German people that they have suffered a total military defeat and that they cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves since their own ruthless warfare and fanatical Nazi resistence have destroyed German economy and made suffering and chaos inevitable." Among the subjects left for the final settlement are boundary claims, with two exceptions. Russia's claim to Koenigsberg, the capital of East Prussia and Poland's claims on Danzig and the balance of East Prussia have already been honored.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Council of Foreign Ministers from the big five has been established for the purpose of drawing up peace treaties with the minor Axis satellites, namely, Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland. These will be submitted to the United Nations.

A stern warning to Spain declared that, until Generalissimo Franco and his government are removed from power, Spain cannot hope to become a member of the United Nations.

JAPANESE DOOM SEALED

The Potsdam ultimatum of July 26 to Japan was a three-power proclamation signed by Britain, China and the United States. "We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction." A few days later the world heard Japan's fateful reply: "so far as the Imperial government of Japan is concerned it will take no notice of this proclamation." No one realized how prompt and devastating the Anglo-American reply would be.

LABOR LANDSLIDE

Winston Churchill and his opponent in the election, Clement Attlee, took time out from the meeting at Potsdam and returned to Great Britain for two days—to witness the greatest political upheaval that the British have had in many years. The Labor party won an overwhelming majority in Parliament, 195 seats, which meant that Churchill, Prime Minister since May, 1940, and the greatest war leader that Britain had known since William Pitt, was repudiated. Churchill, as well as the rest of the world, had apparently expected a close Conservative victory after his resignation on May 23 and the dissolution of Parliament on June 15. Following a short and bitter campaign, the British went to the polls on July 5. The final results could not be announced until July 26 when the overseas vote had come in.

The reaction to the defeat of Churchill was widespread. A Russian diplomat, although he expressed pleasure at hearing of the Tory defeat, was sorry to see Churchill go. The Russians knew just where they stood with him and considered him one of the great builders of victory. People in the United States were surprised that the British had discarded the man who had pulled victory out of defeat in the early days of the war and wondered just how far left Britain would go. In Europe the Labor victory encouraged the growing forces of the Left and weakened still further the last authoritative holdouts.

As for the British, they had cheered Churchill but had voted for the program which they thought best. Labor had declared itself for (1) immediate nationalization of coal and power resources; (2) nationaliza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ion of the privately owned Bank of England and liberalization of credit; (3) an immediate broadening of social security and increase in benefits; (4) government control of housing, employment and agriculture.

In one of his first official statements, the new prime minister made it clear that his government's major goal in the international field was a complete and total victory over Japan. On the whole, British foreign policy is not likely to change.

Among Mr. Attlee's first cabinet appointments were: Ernest Bevin to replace glamorous Anthony Eden as Foreign Secretary; Hugh Dalton became Chancellor of the Exchequer; Arthur Greenwood, Lord Privy Seal; Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade; Sir William Jowitt, Lord Chancellor.

PETAIN, WAR CRIMINAL

Accused of high treason, Henri Philippe Petain, 89 year old hero of Verdun, Marshal of France and chief of the late Vichy government, went on trial for his life before the High Court of Justice in Paris on July 23. Testimonial after testimonial, witness after witness—ex-Premier Paul Reynaud, ex-Premier Edouard Daladier, last President of France Albert ebrun, President of the French Senate Jules Jeanneney, Socialist Leon Blum—blamed the old man for the betrayal of France in the spring of 940. Petain's defense was his belief that he had saved France from a orse fate; "History will show the evils from which I saved France. . . . The people of France . . . conferred power upon me. It is to them only hat I am responsible." But the people of France are no longer willing o take up his cause. On August 15, Petain was convicted and sentenced o death.

Petain's trial was temporarily overshadowed by the arrival in France of Pierre Laval, former chief of the Vichy regime. After a 90-day stay in Spain, he had been ordered out of the country and, flying o southern Germany, had given himself up to the United States authorties there. Already condemned to death *in absentia*, Laval testified in Petain's treason trial.

FRATERNIZATION

In answer to the protests and objections raised by the soldiers occuying Germany, the G.I.'s code of behavior was relaxed toward the end of July. Formerly the British and American soldiers were allowed only 'to speak and play with little children." Now, according to General isenhower's announcement, G.I. Joe and Tommy Atkins are allowed to converse with adult Germans on the streets and in public places. The change was ordered by Army authorities because of the "rapid progress" n the denazification of Germany.

103323
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Battlefronts

The month of July saw Japanese confidence in the outcome of the war shrivel before the wall of fire set by the almost incessant activity of American B-29's. The all-out attack was gradually becoming as methodical and "round-the-clock" as were the Fortress and Liberator raids in the final weeks of the European war. City after city was put on General LeMay's list, industrial centers like Tokyo itself, and Nagoya and Osaka; great ports and shipping centers like Kobe, Kure and Yokohama; finally, as these were left rocking from the blows delivered, the smaller cities, many the centers of vital industry, were taken under the bomb-sights of the Superforts. The results were staggering: Tokyo suffered 50 per cent damage, Takushima was 75 per cent destroyed, while the results of other raids ranged from 15 to 75 per cent destruction of the target cities.

Clearly, this is the supreme test of the efficacy of air power. While its contribution to the European victory cannot be minimized, neither can the enormous contribution of the ground forces be denied. However, in the war in the Far East, air power stands upon its own merits. To date, the results have been impressive, for in the middle of July a definite peace move came out of the besieged Japanese Empire. The Allied reply was a curt ultimatum reiterating the adamant "unconditional surrender." Japan, not yet ready to accept those terms, indicated that the fight would continue. American warships were ready for the challenge. Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet appeared off the shores of Honshu—the main island of the Japanese homeland—and for two hours leisurely bombed a city only 275 miles north of Tokyo. So certain was the Admiral of the impotence of the Japanese navy and air force that he boldly announced the names of the ships participating in the attack and allowed correspondents to give a running account of the action via the ship's radio.

THE DIVINE WIND

Although the Japanese failed, the ghosts of their ancestors made a valiant attempt to defend the Empire's "holy soil." Legend has it that in the thirteenth century the fleet of the Mongol conqueror, Kubla Khan, turned back from the very shores of the islands by a "divine wind" and thus the islands were saved from conquest. Now the United States Navy reports that, on June 5, a violent storm, tearing northward from the Philippines, ripped through the Third Fleet. Gales of 138-miles-an-hour tossed the mighty ships about like match-sticks. Hardest hit was the year-old cruiser *Pittsburgh*, which lost 104 feet of its bow as two great waves washed over it. Fortunately, not a man was lost and the *Pittsburgh* limped back to Guam for repairs. A week later a tug put into port, carrying with it the missing "Pittsburgh suburb."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HREAT TO "RICE BOWL"

The great Chinese offensive ground to a protesting halt in all sectors. Content to hold the Chinese in check in some areas while their own troops withdrew, the enemy turned and scored important gains south of hangsha. This Japanese counter-offensive has a dual purpose:—it is imed at encircling China's vital "rice bowl" on the one hand, while on he other, it is to widen the enemy-held corridor from the southeast, in rder that the threatened northern invasion coast of China may be bolstered by reinforcements from southern China.

A surprising development in the Pacific was the announcement hat Major General Claire L. Chennault, of "Flying Tiger" fame, had resigned. The man who, since December, 1941, kept a handful of planes operating on a shoestring, in a desperate attempt to keep the lifeline to China over "the Hump" open, could see his Fourteenth Air Force being relegated to a back-seat. Pleading ill health, he told his Chinese friends: "I regret I cannot be with you at the end."

RIVERS OF OIL

Aussie forces which had driven from the coast of Borneo to Balikpapan were stopped in their tracks by a flaming river of oil as the Japanese fired a great storage tank. It took some fast stepping to avoid he live fire that spilled like lava down the little ridge, but when it had burnt itself out, the Aussie advance, aided by Allied naval guns offhore, continued.

Yet these blows paled beside the greatest which was yet to come, the se of the atomic bomb, followed almost immediately by Russia's leclaration of war (August 8) on Japan. Under this twin onslaught he Japanese will to fight finally crumbled.

The Home Front

By the time Congress adjourned at the end of July, it had supported he Administration's international measures straight down the line. The ecord was good. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in xactly the form requested by the late President Roosevelt. Attention ext centered on Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks, and Congress uccessfully got itself out of the forest.

BRETTON WOODS

President Truman had described the International Monetary Fund nd Bank for Reconstruction as an essential counterpart to the World ecurity Organization. Party lines were erased when the House on une 7 voted, 345 to 18, to permit this country to join the Bretton Woods plan. As many business groups and even the American Bankers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Association gave the plan their qualified support, the Senate Banking Committee approved the legislation, with only Republicans Taft, Thomas, Butler and Millikin casting the dissenting votes. On July 19, after four days of debate, the Senate passed the measure, 61 to 16, thus making the United States the first nation to ratify the agreements. The international monetary fund aims at ensuring stability of currency exchanges, while the bank is designed to furnish long-term loans for reconstruction and economic development. The American contribution of $6,000,000,000 is the first concrete test of whether our internationalism was composed of more than pious words.

The following day the Senate passed a House-approved bill increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank from $760,000,000 to $3,500,000,000.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The momentous measure before the Senate was the United Nations Charter, although its passage by far more than the necessary two-thirds vote was a foregone conclusion. Fearful that the public was expecting too much from the new world organization, proponents spent most of their time telling what the Charter would not do. Hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee opened on July 9 with the testimony of Edward Stettinius, whom President Truman has appointed American delegate at the Security Council. The solemnity of the hearings was broken when opposition witnesses appeared to denounce the new League as something which would "set up a world government for the Soviets' and "a plot to make the Duke of Windsor king of the world." One witness charged that "the real war criminals are sitting right in this room.'

After five days in committee, and one week ahead of schedule, the measure was reported out by a vote of 21 to 1, with California's Hiram Johnson voting "nay." The Charter was unscathed by a single reservation or amendment. The League covenant twenty-five years ago left the Senate committee with four reservations and thirty-eight amendments. There were six days of debate in the Senate, and Senator Wheeler delivered the only important broadside against the measure. He indicated, however, that the real fight would be postponed until next spring, when Congress debates the powers of our Security Council delegate. On June 28 the Senate, 89 to 2, ratified the United Nations Charter. With Senator Johnson too ill to be present, Senators Langer of North Dakota and Shipstead of Minnesota cast the opposing votes. The United States was thus the first of the large nations to ratify the Charter although Nicaragua, El Salvador and Costa Rica had previously done so.

Though Congress had much to its credit in the international field Senators and Representatives left for home without acting on many important domestic measures. Observers feel that the lack of definite Con

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressional action on reconversion, unemployment compensation, extension of the Social Security program, and simplification of the G.I. Bill of Rights make a difficult period still harder.

FEPC

An indication that the unanimity achieved in foreign matters did not extend to the home front was seen in the fight over funds for the Fair Employment Practices Committee. The Administration had requested $599,000 for the committee. The Southern Democrats, true to form, stoutly opposed any appropriations at all. For weeks they hopelessly tangled parliamentary proceedings and held up appropriations for 20 war agencies. But the Southern bloc was finally worn down and on July 12, $250,000 was appropriated for the FEPC. The agency was given the option of using the money to liquidate or to continue its functions. All signs indicate that it is going right ahead with business as usual.

SENATORS MAKE NEWS

Two Senators were in the news last month. Carter Glass, 87-year-old Virginia Senator, has been absent since 1942 from Congress because of illness. Although he has not appeared on Capitol Hill for three years, he is still chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee. In the first case of its kind, an effort is now being made to force Senator Glass to resign. John Locke Green, Arlington County Treasurer, has filed a petition with the State Supreme Court to compel the governor to call an election in November to replace Glass, whose term does not expire until 1949. If the court supports the petition, which is doubtful, it would force the governor to declare Glass's seat vacant because of his long absence from the Senate.

Mississippi's Senator ("The Man") Bilbo, criticized because of his vigorous opposition to the FEPC, has been splattering liberal hunks of his state's mud on minority groups. To New York's Miss Piccolo he wrote: "Dear Dago; . . . Will you, please, keep your dirty proboscis out of the other 47 states, especially the dear old state of Mississippi?" Leonard Goldritch, secretary of the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism, was told by Bilbo: "If Jews of your type don't quit sponsoring and fraternizing with the Negro race you are going to arouse so much opposition that they will get a very strong invitation to pack up and re-settle in Palestine. . . . "

TRANSPORTATION JAM

Plans for civilian summer vacations received a jolt from the Office of Defense Transportation on June 29, when it was announced that train reservations could be made only five days in advance. The redeployment of troops to the Pacific also made necessary another ruling:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no sleeping car accommodations can be used in trips between points less than 450 miles apart.

A three-cornered fight developed over the transportation jam. J. Monroe Johnson, ODT head, blamed the Army for not divulging when or how many trains would be needed in the redeployment program. Johnson told the Senate War Investigating Committee that last September the Army assured him that only troops not to be used in the Pacific would be returned here. Then in April he heard that more than 2,000,000 men would be brought back, most of them to be reassigned to the Pacific. In June, arrivals from Europe were 50,000 more than anticipated, and in July, 97,000 more. The Army disputed Johnson's charges and claimed that the jam was not serious. Major General Franklin also told the Committee that he considered it unimportant to notify the ODT of arrivals from Europe. This was too much for Chairman James Mead, who threatened to take the matter directly to President Truman unless the Army cooperated with civilian government agencies. War Mobilization Director Snyder stepped in and, on July 28, announced that a working agreement had been reached between the ODT, the American Association of Railroads and the War Department which "will go a long way to solve" the muddled transportation problem.

The root difficulty is the fact that 300,000 experienced railroad workers have gone into the armed forces, and 30 per cent fewer passenger cars are available than during the last war, while the railroads are asked to handle two and a half times as much traffic. President Truman pointed up the critical situation when he stated that the western railroads needed 65,000 more men. The Army has thus for stoutly refused to release skilled railroad men, claiming that such a procedure would disrupt the point system and greatly damage the morale of Pacific-bound troops.

LABOR SCENE

The labor front reflected the nation's exhaustion and lethargy following V-E Day. The most spectacular dispute was the New York newspaper strike. The strike of the Newspaper and Mail Deliverers Union began on July 1 and the majority of the area's 13,000,000 readers were without their papers for seventeen days. After the WLB unsuccessfully ordered the strikers back to work, it took the unprecedented step of canceling entirely the old contract. When the union, however, voted to return to work and to accept the jurisdiction and authority of the WLB, the old contract was extended until a new one is signed.

There were also strikes at the five New Jersey plants of the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, at the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company in Akron, at the Chicago plant of Chrysler, and at Graham-Paige Mo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tors Corporation in Detroit. Early in August, 40,000 workers were idle due to disputes. Perhaps one reason for the wave of strikes was to be found in the announcement by the War Manpower Commission that 2,000,000 workers will be unemployed by August 1 because of cutbacks.

NEW YORK TRAGEDY

Disaster hit New York City on July 28 when a Mitchell B-25 bomber crashed into the 1,250 foot high Empire State building. The pilot, Major William F. Smith, was apparently lost in the fog which shrouded the top of the building. Observers thought that the plane was in trouble as it raced downtown at a dangerously low altitude, since the engine had a peculiar throb. One person said it was flying only on one motor. It appeared that the pilot tried desperately to gain altitude but failed to see the Empire State building until too late.

When the fog, hiding the scene from the street, lifted half an hour later, the bomber was wedged near the eightieth floor amid the flames. Fourteen people were killed and 25 injured, and nearly 20 floors caught fire. The majority of the victims were employees of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, whose offices on the 79th floor were turned into a raging inferno by blazing gasoline from the bomber.

ROOSEVELT'S DEBTS

Brig. Gen. Elliott Roosevelt finally explained his long silence on the bad debts which he had accumulated while his father was President. The War Department announced that he had sought inactive duty on May 11, a month before Westbrook Pegler made public the facts concerning the loans. Roosevelt stated that he requested that he be put on the inactive list because there was no need in the Pacific for the type of aerial photography which he had done in Europe. Roosevelt had accumulated 233 points, and the War Department announced, on July 31, that he would be retired August 15. While he was still in the Army, said Roosevelt, he felt it inappropriate to refer to the "pernicious charges and lies" published in some newspapers. He denounced as a "deliberate, infamous lie" any statement that his father had ever "promoted or assisted" the general's monetary dealings. "I conducted my own business affairs. The responsibility for them was and still is mine, and mine alone."

* * *

● A certain well known general was accosted by a beggar, who claimed to be an old soldier.

"Old soldier, eh!" barked the general. "Then I'll give you a test. 'Tenshun. Eyes right, eyes front — Now, what comes next?"

"Present alms," was the instant rejoinder. He got the hand-out.

—*Wall Street Journal*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Getting Ahead of Ourselves

By Paul Jones

From his column "Candid Shots" in The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin

By every indication, we are heading toward a fairly weird world. We have all the more confidence in current efforts to promote a lasting peace, because we believe people are going to be too busy with other things to manage a first-class war.

To cite only one example, it will take a heap of adjustment before we get used to the changes produced by such little numbers as the new jet-propulsion planes.

The last report had them traveling at speeds up around 700 miles an hour, and the experts mention 1,000 or more m.p.h. as something just around the corner.

If you start to figure out what this will do to the air transport customer, you become a little dizzy. The crow-flight distance from here to the Pacific Coast is somewhat less than 3,000 miles, and the difference in time is three hours.

Therefore, unless our slide rule is warped, you will be able to leave this city, and arrive in San Francisco before you started. A 9 a.m. departure from Northeast Airport will enable you to keep a 9 a.m. appointment on Nob Hill.

So far, so good. But now look forward a little further to the days when these new-fangled flying machines will be scheduled out on round-the-world trips, every hour on the hour. Step up the speeds just a trifle, and what is going to happen?

You are going to be able to fly west from Philadelphia, taking off, say, at 10 a.m. and see a man about some insurance at 9 a.m. on the same day. And in Philadelphia, mind you. It doesn't sound right, except to us scientists, but it looks very much as if you will be back before you start.

This will cause complications.

Imagine a scene at the breakfast table of the future, which we envisage as one of the few firm spots in a shifting cosmos. The husband, in a tearing hurry, is trying to see how the A's made out, and drink his coffee at the same time.

The wife: "Where's the fire lover? Don't tell me you're not going to eat your scrapple, after all the trouble I went to—"

The husband: "I gotta get to the airport in ten minutes."

The wife: "But, pet, you just came back from the airport. It seems to me you're always over there. What's the attraction?"

The husband (darkly) "Don't start that stuff. You know perfectly well I got in at 5 a.m. this morning on the plane that leaves here ten minutes from now. Can I help it if that's how the schedule works out?"

The wife: "I don't understand it."

Copyright 1945, by The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The husband: "I've explained it to you a hundred times if I explained it once. We've got ahead of the sun. That's all."

The wife: "Couldn't they slow down just once, and let the sun catch up? You must get awful sick of traveling with the same passengers day after day. Unless the stewardess—"

The husband: "Look, how could I have got back four hours ago, if I don't catch this plane? You don't think I enjoy this, do you? This makes 46 consecutive days I've flown around the world. It's as bad as a squirrel cage. The worst of it is, I don't see how I'm ever going to get out of it, unless the ship breaks down. But they don't break down any more. They never break down — they never break down—"

How this will all end we cannot foretell at the moment. But if we may utter a word of kindly warning, watch those jet-planes, fellows.

No doubt there is a logical flaw somewhere in the dark picture we have just been painting. But we have no intention of looking for it now, because Dr. Vannervar Bush, eminent research man, told us in an article published by the *Atlanitc Monthly* that we may expect machines to do all our routine reasoning for us in the future.

That isn't all he says they can or will do, but it's a fair sample. By the liberal use of electrical relays and solenoid cells, the good doctor foresees a quiet thinker sitting at his Arguegraph, tapping away at its keys.

It will be a simple matter (all except learning the touch system, which apparently will be as hard as ever). All you will have to do is feed into the mechanism those facts or accepted truths which you want to link up in a closely-knit chain of logic.

We fancy a bit of abracadabra will intervene — a low, humming noise and possibly a few flashing lights. These will not be really necessary, any more than they are on a pin-ball board, but the public will demand something more than the dismal silence in which it does its own thinking for itself.

Presently, the machine will deliver a neatly typed set of conclusions, in rigorous conformity with the data which you feed it. Here we see a possible disappointment for some purchasers of this scientific marvel. It is all very well for a laboratory worker to risk getting back no more than a formal arrangement of the truth.

But what about a political orator? Or any other zealous partisan?

Suppose you fed the machine a number of statements which you thought proved absolutely that you would be elected a burgess of your borough. What if the machine disagreed with you, told you, in fact, that you wouldn't have a chance? Would stand for it? Haven't we the right to count on a certain elementary loyalty from our machines?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Danger Ahead in France

By Marquis W. Childs

From his column "The State of the Nation" in The New York Post

● From France come disturbing reports of the turmoil that is so close to the surface in that troubled and tragic country. Among the hundreds of thousands of returned war prisoners and slave laborers are carriers of Nazism. Either they were pro-Nazi before they left France or they have been infected by intensive German propaganda during their long exile.

Still another possibility is not discounted by those who have studied recent confidential reports out of France. The Nazi underground may have planted agents among these returning Frenchmen to work toward the end of Nazifying all Europe.

Strongly organized propaganda against the United States is believed to stem from certain of the returnees. In the unhappiness of the French people, who were led to expect so much more help from us than they have received, this anti-American propaganda finds all too ready acceptance.

Complicating the situation are several million G. I.'s. They are passing through France on their way to the States. They are in Paris on leave. With the war in Europe ended, they see little reason why they should have to stay there, and they make their discontent fairly vocal.

Here are the elements of an explosion. Even if it does not come, except in minor blow-offs such as have been reported from time to time, the situation will generate frustration and ill feeling that years of good will cannot erase.

We, on our part, have contributed little to understanding between the two republics. Too often we have been hypercritical.

Recently three members of Congress returned from an investigation of European food shortages. They reported that the people of France "were sitting around doing nothing and waiting for us to feed them." That is a childish oversimplification which can only cause more ill will.

Unfortunately, it reflects an attitude becoming more current among officials here. The tendency is to look skeptically on European food shortages, to say that the Europeans are not doing enough to help themselves.

The French have quite another story to tell. They point to coal shipments so small that French industry could not get going even if other supplies were available. The British were about to cut off the 175,000 tons they have been sending across the Channel and only the sharpest protests prevented this from happening. The French say that 40 per cent of the coal they are getting goes to transport U. S. soldiers and U. S. sup-

Copyright 1945, by The New York Post, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lies and, while this may be a enerous estimate, the proportion is undoubtedly large.

The French peasant, having learned through centuries of upeaval to be a squirrel, is hoardng his produce rather than taking it to town to sell for inflated francs. he inflation is serious and the e Gaulle government seems to be ble to do very little about it. e Gaulle himself, at his best when he was defending the honor f France against the world, has failed to attack the immediate problems that confront his country. Perhaps the fault is not his; perhaps the root causes are beyond his control.

In any event, these are the realities today. The malady goes deep, but the surface symptoms are not hard to find. In recent weeks there have been anti-Semitic demonstrations in France.

You don't have to be a very expert prophet to see which way all his is leading. With cold houses and empty cupboards in the fall and winter there will be rioting or worse. American soldiers may get hurt. They may be killed.

No great powers of imagination are required to foresee the reaction over here. Our isolationists today are keeping quiet. They are giving perfunctory approval to the San Francisco Charter. But how they would welcome an upheaval in Europe! It would give them the chance they are waiting for to say "I told you so," to say that international cooperation is impossible.

It would be welcomed, too, by those elements in Europe, both on the left and the right, who want to discredit American democracy. The Fascists would exploit that kind of trouble to the utmost.

Let's get De Gaulle over here. Why the recent coyness when he said he wanted to come? A little more understanding and a little less recrimination may prevent a major tragedy next winter.

Canada Takes the Middle Road

By William Henry Chamberlin

From an article in The Progressive

Paradoxical as it may sound, he most surprising feature of Canada's recent national election is hat it revealed no great surprise n the sense of a sensational shift f balance in parliamentary power. The old maestro of Canadian politics, Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, has brought his Liberal mark into port, battered, to be sure, but still seaworthy. A new government under his leadership is accepted as a certainty both because the Liberals, although considerably reduced in strength, are still much the largest group in Parliament and because there is no conceivable basis of positive

Copyright 1945, by The Progressive, Madison, Wisconsin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cooperation between the second strongest party, the Progressive Conservatives, and the third strongest, the CCF.

The lower House in the Canadian Parliament (the Senate is appointed, not elected) has 245 members. These seats were distributed as follows, according to reasonably complete figures which may be altered in a few cases by the vote of the servicemen: Liberals, 118, Progressive Conservatives 66, CCF 26, Social Credit 13, Independent Liberals 8, Independents 8, scattering 6. Among the latter six are three intransigent French Canadian Nationalists and one Labor Progressive.

As is often the case, the Canadian election was very inadequately reported in this country. It is high time that we began to practice some cultural and educational reciprocity with our friendly northern neighbor.

Although Mr. King's comfortable majority in the last parliament, elected in the spring of 1940, has been transformed into a distinctly lean margin of superiority, a margin which exists only on the assumption that the so-called Independent Liberals will support him on most issues, he came out better than most Canadian forecasters have been predicting on the basis of provincial elections and political moods during the last two years.

The Conscription Issue

This is because two new movements in Canadian politics which had been developing steam and momentum during the period of war pressures and irritations showed up rather more weakly in the test of a postwar election than had been generally anticipated. These were the rebellious French Canadian nationalists in Quebec and the nationwide socialist farmer-labor CCF (Cooperative Commonwealth Federation).

The enforcement of conscription for overseas service is always a critical issue in Canadian politics. King might have stumbled and broken his political neck over this issue if the election had been held six months earlier when the Prime Minister was under heavy fire from two directions, from Quebec for going too far toward conscription, from Ontario, richest and most populous of the Canadian provinces, for doing too little.

The enforcement of compulsory overseas service in the last war, against the bitter and almost unanimous opposition of French-speaking Quebec, cast a blight on the subsequent fortunes of the Conservative Party, recently rechristened Progressive Conservative. Mackenzie King, one of the very few English-speaking Liberals who supported the French Canadian Liberal leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in opposing conscription in the last war, won a long period of unchanging devotion from Quebec. And that province's 65 seats are a comfortable nest-egg in a lower House of 245 members.

In the first phase of the war there was agreement among all parties that Canadian participation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hould be on a volunteer basis. Pressure for conscription became tronger after the fall of France ınd took on a distinctly racial haracter, despite the efforts of the ;overnment to softpedal this ele- nent in the situation.

A plebiscite on the question vhether the government should be elieved of its obligation not to ıpply conscription for overseas ervice, held in 1942, revealed ı pro-conscription majority in he eight predominantly English- peaking provinces, and an anti- ;onscription majority in Quebec. Although the majority in the whole ;ountry was about five to three in avor of releasing the government rom its promise, King showed ;onspicuous reluctance to impose ;ompulsion for overseas service. (Conscription for service within Canada, stretched to include such olaces as the Aleutian Islands and Newfoundland, had been instituted after the fall of France).

A good deal of unofficial pres- ;ure was put on soldiers who were ;onscripted for service in Canada ;o volunteer for overseas. But, al- through the government obtained the passage of a bill authorizing ;onscription, Mr. King only made use of this power, and with ob- vious unwillingness, when the pro- ongation of the war and the heavy losses of Canadian troops in Europe threatened to create diffi- ulties with an adequate supply of replacements.

Had an election been held at he height of this dispute, toward the end of 1944, Quebec might well have voted heavily against King because he yielded on over- seas conscription. Ontario might have done likewise on the ground that he yielded too little and too late. But now the European phase of the war has ended. The Prime Minister has stated that there will be no conscription for the war against Japan.

The heavy Progressive Conser- vative vote in Ontario is partly the result of discontent with the Prime Minister's so-called "coddling" of Quebec on the conscription ques- tion. But the French-speaking vot- ers of Quebec, in the majority, seem to have felt that it was more expedient to support King than to run the risk of letting in the Pro- gressive Conservative leader, John Bracken, who based his campaign partly on the argument that con- scription for overseas service should be generally applied.

Another reason for the weak showing of French nationalism is the division among its spokesmen. The prolonged illness of the staunchest and ablest of the un- compromising French nationalist leaders, Maxime Raymond, helps to explain the negligible showing of the Bloc Populaire, a party which started in 1943 with a rather formidable show of strength. Mr. Raymond won his seat, but only one other Bloc Populaire candi- date was returned to Ottawa.

The CCF, with between 25 and 30 seats, fell short of what its friends had hoped for and some of its opponents had feared. Most of its elected members are from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prairie province of Saskatchewan, where the CCF won a sweeping provincial victory and possesses an effective local organization. But in the older and more populous regions of Canada east of the Great Lakes only one CCF candidate was elected.

The farmer appeal of the party was apparently more effective than its labor appeal, because Saskatchewan is one of the most rural provinces of Canada, with no large industry.

Explaining CCF's Setback

The CCF emerged as a potential strong challenger to the traditional Liberal-Conservative two-party system when it took second place in an Ontario provincial election in 1943, winning 34 seats out of 90. But a new party like the CCF, with an imperfected organization in a large part of the country, must expect ups and downs, occasional setbacks after striking local successes. CCF leaders are inclined to blame the Communists, because of their splitting tactics, for the loss of some seats.

The Communists, or Labor Progressives, as they prefer to call themselves, put up candidates in many districts where they had no chance of success, but were able to take away enough of the labor vote to put in the Liberal or the Conservative. It polled about 15 per cent of the total vote reported today; and this is considerably better than the American Socialist Party ever did, even in the days when Gene Debs was a magnetic popular leader and the party had not gone to wreck in a series of splits and splinters.

The CCF has a devoted nucleus of local workers and several national leaders of marked ability, in men like M. J. Coldwell, Frank Scott, David Lewis, E. B. Joliffe It may be temporarily "down" in terms of its more ambitious hopes But it is far from "out," and can be relied on to press its arguments for intensive socialization and state planning with increasing force in the event of the development of a postwar economic crisis.

Perhaps the foremost immediate practical result of the election is that there will not be a chaotic parliamentary situation, demanding the formation of some kind of coalition. King will be able to carry on, at least temporarily, although his government will be more vulnerable and probably will not last as long as his administration which took office in 1940.

A Look at the Future

King is a middle-of-the-road kind of person who will try to stick pretty close to the middle of the road, as between the Right of the Progressive Conservatives, and the Left of the CCF. The Liberal Party has always been supported by some powerful monied interests, and drastic experiments in nationalization of industry are scarcely to be expected. On the other hand, King may try to steal CCF thunder in the field of social security. His "baby bonus" measuse, already enacted into law, with its flat payment of allowances for children between certain ages, may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well be a token of things to come.

In foreign policy also King may be expected to steer a middle passage between the sentimental Tory "Great Britain right or wrong" sentiment that is still prevalent among some of the Conservatives and the radical distaste of extreme French Canadian nationalists for the connection with England.

Picture of the U.S.A.

By George A. Benson

From his column "In Perspective" in The Providence Evening Bulletin

● I have embarked upon my own Lend-Lease program for Russia. It is an uncovenanted lagniappe, without political or social cachet, and most people will put no pass by it, but that does not matter. It will get nowhere, I know, and that does not matter, for there is much satisfaction in it. It is very helpful, too, as you will see when you undertake it, as I assume you will. Already, I have enlisted promoters and fautors, and they have become very enthusiastic about the whole thing, so much so that they have been inclined to get out of hand in their contributions.

I recently learned that the National Committee of Russian War Relief in the United States wants 1000 "'good' books about America, substantial, trustworthy books, novels about American life, biographies, histories, books on science, mechanics, art, education." The purpose, of course, is to give the Russians a clear understanding of America, its people, its cities and towns and villages, its institutions, its achievements, its life. My Lend-Lease program seeks to serve that purpose, so:

What 10 American books would you send to Moscow to tutor up the Russians to a real appreciation of all that is American? Take it easy, in jotting down your list, for there is a very nice point involved. I passed this question out to a considerable number of *The Journal-Bulletin* staff, and the replies came back fairly quickly. A couple of them were cynical, one was pretty randy, but all the others were extremely interesting and highly provocative. But once memory had been prodded, there were emandations (of judgment), changes and numerous additions. Some couldn't be held to a choice of 10, so interesting had become the research. After all, each person's appreciation of the great luminous figures of American literature was at play, and each list represented a personal idea of what the Russians should learn of America.

It is impossible, of course, to reprint the lists. Some of them leaned heavily on fiction, but as the late reports came in, poetry gained considerably; so did biography and history and analyses of

Copyright 1945, by The Providence Evening Bulletin, Providence, Rhode Island

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

typical phases of American life, as, for example, "Middletown" by the Lynds. This book, a happy choice if a real understanding of American life is the purpose, appeared on three lists.

In history, it is either the Beards' or the Nevens-Commager work, or, preferably, both. The Beards appeared on three lists, Nevens and Commager on four. Personally, I would choose the Beards' "Rise of American Civilization," with Mr. Beards' "Economic Basis of Politics" (brought up to date, as it should be) thrown in, and the Morison and Commager "The Growth of the American Republic." Two chose Parrington's "Main Currents in American Thought," and, certainly it should rank high in any selection.

The choice of biographies and autobiographies was limited. Five picked "The Education of Henry Adams," one the autobiography of Franklin, three Sandburg's "Lincoln," and two "The Life and Works of Justice Holmes." One picked Frank Lloyd Wright's fascinating and stimulating autobiography, an exceptionally good choice for the Russia of today.

Walt Whitman, naturally, topped all the poets. Five picked him, two specifying "Democratic Vistas" along with "Leaves of Grass." Untermeyer's anthology, "Modern American Poetry," was chosen by one as a comprehensive survey which includes Whitman.

* * *

There was much more agreement on fiction. Three books—Carl Van Doren calls them "simply great"—appeared on several lists: "Huckleberry Finn," "The Scarlet Letter" and "Moby Dick." The surprising thing, however, was the number of votes cast for Sinclair Lewis' "Main Street" and "Babbitt" and John Dos Passos' "U. S. A." All agreed that fiction constitutes an excellent medium for an understanding of American life, though two recognized the danger of acquiring a distorted view, and it was because of this reasoning, far more so than in the case of "The Scarlet Letter" and "Moby Dick," that Lewis and Dos Passos ranked at the top of the novelists. "Main Street," of course, is a true story of an American village, the symbol of a narrow provincialism which still is found in many sections of America. "Babbitt" is archetypal of the conventional American businessman. The two books, as Van Doren has pointed out, are "landmarks in the history of American opinions through two decades." Yet in many respects, a Russian reader would get a deeper, more inclusive idea of Americans, their life and thought, from Dos Passos' "U. S. A." The devices he used in this far-ranging, all-embracing trilogy, would make sure of that far more effectively than Lewis' realism and satire. In fact, it is a book Americans themselves could re-read to their advantage. Other novels, notably E. A. Rolvaag's "Giants in the Earth," were listed, but the emphasis was on all the books antecedently named.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Lowdown on the "Stoop Market"

By Sgt. Henry McLemore

From Mrs. McLemore's column in The Philadelphia Record

After many months of overseas duty, I am happy to report upon my return that there is no Black Market in these United States.

What we have in this country is a Stoop Market.

Everything comes from under the counter.

Clerks who weighed 225 pounds when I felt this town to go to war are now down to 135 soaking wet. They achieved this sharp reduction, with its attendant attractiveness, not by going to Elizabeth Arden's for a beauty course, but but stooping to reach under the counter for hidden eggs and bacon and cigarettes.

I have been away too long, my account is too minor, to be on the Stooping List. But long before I was a soldier I was a reporter, so my ears and eyes have seen things like this:

Mrs. Roundabout Edwards enters the grocery store. She asks the manager if he has any bacon. He gives her a look and a wink that says, "Yes, I have some bacon, but why do you ask me before all of these other people who are looking for bacon?" So, Mrs. Roundabout Edwards follows the manager. Tags at his heels. Suddenly there is a clearing out of the customers. Life a thief running with a bankroll, the manager opens a locked locker, glances furtively about, and pulls out a pound of the sacred pig. He wraps it in a nondescript bunch of brown paper. Mrs. Roundabout Edwards hides it in the folds of her dress and, just as if she were leaving the scene of a crime with a smoking pistol, darts out into the daylight and heads for home.

The same goes for cigarettes and eggs and all the other things that are hard to get. Stoop. Stoop. Stoop. Look around to see if anyone is looking. Look around to see if anyone is coming.

I talked to a woman today who frankly admits that she gets her butter and eggs and cheese and meat from the Stoop Market.

"But it is hardly worth it," she said wearily, pulling on a cigarette that was fresh from the Stoop Market. "Today I went down to get a dozen eggs and two veal chops. I had to wait exactly one hour until the manager could stoop without being seen. Twice, I had been there so long, other customers came up and asked me the prices of articles. Thought I was working there."

If I had enough points to get out of the Army and were looking for a new business (*Readers' Digest* might look into this as a new form of Little Business), I would organize midgets to work beneath the counters of the nation's stores. They would operate out of sight, where everything is hidden. They

Copyright 1945, by The Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would wear little uniforms and be paid according to how well they remembered what customer should get what, and could only be fired if proved guilty of giving the wrong person his share of the right thing.

It has become obvious to me, on my furlough, that for the civilian to get any of the food that makes for an epicurean's dream, such as pork chops, butter, bacon and steaks, he must have played one-eyed cat, bean bag and prisoner's base with the butchers and grocers. From the likes of what has been served at my table, my wife must have during her girlhood days gone steady with the captain of the basketball team. She doesn't know anybody who stoops.

As she airily explained to me over our fish and oleomargarine, she wouldn't stoop to stoop to speak to a stooping butcher.

I salute my wife's integrity, but I do wish she had—oh, well, pass the oleo.

* * *

THE MILLS OF THE MUSE GRIND SLOWLY

● In recent legislation $101,630 went back to the Indians to pay for the ponies and arms which the Army seized from the Sioux after Custer's Last Stand, June 1876.

Dade County "Pilgrims," stern and Confederate-bound since 1860 when they sent a proclamation to Washington seceding from the Union since Georgia had refused to do so, were welcomed back to the Union fold by President Truman on July 4. The Stars and Bars were lowered and the Stars and Stripes flew over the court house for the first time in 85 years.

Vicksburg, the "Gibralter of the Confederacy," which fell to the Union Army on July 4, 1863, celebrated its first "Fourth" since that date this year. B-29's and 17's from Jackson army air base saluted the 13,000 unknown Union soldiers who lie buried in the national cemetery with lighted flares.

Tom Paine, spiritual father of the Revolution and author of *Common Sense*, was restored to the francise and other rights of citizenship which had been denied him 139 years ago by the own of Rochelle, N. Y.

A certain John Billington, resident of the Plymouth Colony, and husband of Eleanor Billington who had been clamped in the stocks for whispering sour somethings about the local deacon, has at last been cleared of a murder charge. At least his Chicago great-great-great grandson, Chester McNeil, thinks he should be. John, the first man to be hanged for murder in the colony, is unfortunately unable to speak for himself. However, McNeil thinks that he was just an innocent victim of the Law as Billington mistook the victim, Newcommen, who was hiding behind a tree, for an Indian. Could be that Newcommen was blushing or just had acquired a good tan, but we were under the impression that the sun never shone in the hunting season in that neck of the woods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Petain – Victim of Reminiscences

By Samuel Grafton

From his column "I'd Rather Be Right" in The New York Post

There is something queer and hard to look at in the trial of Petain. Treason is not a common offense, anywhere; it is rare, even among thieves and gunmen and prostitutes; any treason trial is a sensation, and the spectacle of a Marshal of France held in the dock on this sort of accusation has in it the elements of a great unnatural wonder.

The thing is complicated by the fact that not even Petain's accusers believe he did whatever he did for money, or for a similar direct advantage; while even his defenders do not believe that he added anything to the lustre of the name of France. The conclusion is forced upon us that if what we are handling here is a crime, it is a new kind of crime, one hardly known before the present age, and one which the old word "treason" covers only approximately.

What we are dealing with, actually, is a kind of sickness of our own time, born out of the conditions of our own age, a disorder without much history or precedent. It is in our day that certain men have become so frightened by the rising power of the people, by democracy itself, that they have shown themselves not unwilling to open the gates and let an enemy nation come in, to enforce the kind of order for which their hearts cry. They do not do this for the sake of the enemy, whom they may hate, nor to harm their own country, which they may love; they may be said to be "victims of their reminiscences"; they destroy their country in the present to keep alive their memories of it as it was in the oligarchical past, before political freedom came.

France ceased to be France, in the minds of certain Frenchmen, when she went left; their patriotism was reserved for an older and vanished France. It must have seemed to them in fantasy that France would be France again, once the left wing parties were stamped out; and the victim of fantasy finds no price too high to pay, not even that of working with the enemy.

It is only on the basis of some such process as that outlined above that we can fit together the apparent contradictions and oddities of the Petain trial. The Hero of Verdun could not really have been a patriot, because he worked with the Germans, says one side; but Petain could not really have sold out to the Germans because he was the Hero of Verdun, answers the other; and the story is a strange one, and the old word "treason" does not quite tell all of it.

As to whether Petain is technically guilty of the precise charges

Copyright 1945, by The New York Post, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laid against him in the indictment, we must, in accordance with a good journalistic tradition, leave it to the tribunal to decide. But it is not so odd to find a Marshal of France on trial, after all, when one remembers that all through Europe it was the avowed "nationalists" of the old, reactionary kind, who seemed to find it easiest to deal with Hitler.

Ours is a day in which the extreme nationalists of many countries joined a kind of bleak international of their own, from Rumania to France; and in the end it was the internationalists who showed themselves rather more willing than the others to fight for national independence. Ours is a day in which the ties of blood were strangely loosened. "Nationalism" in our time lost its national meaning and retained only its reactionary meaning, and, in a strange reversal, was often made the rallying cry for loss of nationhood.

It is for these reasons that the trial of Petain lets loose so much emotion; for it is merely that one man is on trial, for one alleged offense. A disease of our time is under examination. There is no man who has lived through the last 10 years but feels himself in some way involved in it; and when the issues are so large, it is not strange that the symbol of them should be so high a figure as the Marshal of France.

* * *

● A group of British grocers met to decide whether or not they should fill out the new forms issued by the ministry of food. Not only would they take five hours' work, but, it seems, they were issued merely because the Ministry had received an increase in paper supplies.

* * *

● Pidgin English is used in official documents in New Guinea.

* * *

● A complete and generous education fits a man to perform justly, skillfully and magnanimously all the offices of peace and war.

—John Milton

* * *

● Salvage projects in the United Kingdom include the boiling of cotton tracing cloth, which can then be converted into badly needed sheets, pillow slips or bandages. Old oily rags are processed to remove the dirt and recover the valuable oil. The rags can then be re-used as wipers or made into some other cotton article. Formerly waste liquors from airplane factories were a source of annoyance because they polluted streams and damaged drains. Now tankers with power pumps recover the liquors which are scientifically treated to produce chrome sulphate for the leather and textile industries, for use as tannin, or for making pigments for khaki dyes.

—Foreign Commerce Weekly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Trend to the Left

By W. K. Kelsey

From his column "The Commentator" in The Detroit News

There are evidences that the Russians have "jumped the gun" on their Western allies, notably in Berlin, but also throughout the Russian-occupied areas of Germany.

According to a Reuters dispatch from Berlin, the Russians pursued their own policy without waiting for decisions to be made by the Control Council, which is the overall Allied Government of Germany.

In Berlin, it is reported, the *Berliner Zeitung* and the *Taegliche Rundschau* are circulating under Red Army control, not only in the Russian zone, but in those of the three other powers. Under Russian favor, the German Communist Party and the German Social Democratic Party have been revived.

"The Red Army authorities," says the writer, "are clearly doing all they can to restore trade unions and other working class organizations, not only in Berlin, but throughout the half of Germany now under Soviet control.

"The Russians also administer the Berlin radio station and four famous orchestras, including the Philharmonic and the Opera House Orchestra. Giant placards, setting out the policy toward Germans as outlined in Marshal Stalin's speeches, ornament the roads throughout the zones of the Western allies.

"The Russians are making it quite clear that their aims are the complete elimination of the Nazi on the one hand and unlimited cooperation with the Germans even to the re-establishment of the left-wing political parties and organizations on the other.

Now, don't get excited. The Russians have been in Eastern Germany, which they conquered, quite some time. They also took Berlin and their front was considerably west of that city when contact was made with the Americans. The Russians have had to run that part of the country they occupied, and naturally they are running it in their own way—just as the British have been running their northern zone, and the Americans the south.

There had been little opportunity for consultation between the commanders-in-chief of the Big Four on matters of general policy. General Eisenhower had to come home to consult, before he could frame plans. Meanwhile Germany could not run in an administrative vacuum. The Russians have done as they thought best.

Nor does there seem to be much to quarrel about. Everybody is for stamping out Nazism. Some political ideology must replace it; and it was the Communists and the Social Democrats who were the principal opponents of Hitler during his rise to power. If anything of

Copyright 1945, by The Detroit News, Detroit, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the old anti-Nazi spirit remains in Germany, they must have it. If so, they are the logical nucleus around which to build a democratic state.

Hitler destroyed the labor unions because they were unfriendly both to capitalistic control and to the totalitarian state. Therefore why not revive them?

British policy, it is said, is opposed to the revival of political parties in Germany. Perhaps it is feared that they would organize the people to resist the rule of the occupying powers. Doesn't it seem more likely that parties controlled by the workingmen would try to lay the foundations of a democratic state? And isn't it that sort of state which the Allies will eventually recognize?

In fact, Russia seems far more aware of what has taken place on the European continent than either Great Britain or the United States.

Nations now under Russian control—acquiesced to by the British and by us—were for a long time before the war run not by their people, but by the overlords of the people. And these overlords were not unsympathetic to Hitler and his totalitarianism.

It was not they who opposed the German invasion of Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, nor the Nazi control of Bulgaria. The removal of the German yoke would have meant nothing to the majority in these countries unless they were given that freedom for which they have longed, but which they had never enjoyed.

Russia alone has fully realized that point. Americans have been indifferent, or suspicious. Britain has frequently shown a preference to play ball with the remnants of the "elder statesmen" who formerly controlled these nations. But Russia has all along insisted that the government of these countries be placed in the hands of the common people.

That was one reason, and the principal reason, that Russia would have no truck with the Polish Government in London. It was the reason she supported Tito in Yugoslavia. It was the reason why she ousted the Horthy regime in Hungary and the government set up in Rumania.

But this may mean the spread of Communism to the Adriatic, and even to the Alps and the Rhine.

Well, if that is what the people of these regions want, in preference to what they have had, what business is it of ours, provided they adopt it in free elections?

The danger, as the commentator sees it, is not Communism, but a return to the old system of cheating elections, fraudulent governments, police and military control of the people, robbing landlords, purchased foreign concessions, and all the evils of exploitation grafted upon the remnants of a medieval social system.

If Communism is the alternative to all that, then for heaven's sake let Communism be tried; it can be no worse than the evils the peo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple of these countries have endured for generations under their old regimes. At least, the common people have seen a vision of freedom; and if it is no more than freedom as the Russians understand it, it is better than anything they have had in the past.

That is what the Russians understood, and we would do well to understand it also. We might also try to understand that the Russian conception of freedom, while quite different from ours, seems to satisfy the Russians—that immense polyglot nation which has given so magnificent a demonstration of strength and unity. The answer to Communism is something better than Communism—so clearly superior that no one will want anything else.

* * *

● Curare, the deadly arrow poison, long known to the Indians of the Amazon, now saves the lives of fighting men of the United Nations.

Natives who polished off their enemies with curare-coated arrows called the drug "Flying Death," but doctors found refined curare valuable in relieving spastic paralysis and in relaxing muscles of mental patients undergoing convulsive shock.

—*Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs*

* * *

Freedom of the Press Soars to Earth

● Remote regions of Scotland are no longer worried about lack of news. Islands of the west coast have been receiving newspapers on week-ends only. Now arrangements are being made to parachute papers daily to these forsaken areas. Where formerly a parachute landing might have meant the unwelcome danger of an enemy agent, now it will be a means of promoting the knowledge of current events.

* * *

● Redundancy can be very effective—at times. Playwright Sir Henry Irvine often received manuscripts from aspiring writers and was asked to give his opinion. Honesty always guided him. To one amateur, he wrote, "My dear Sir—I have read your play. Oh, my dear Sir!"

* * *

● The Treaty of Ghent following the War of 1812 provided that the Six Nations Indians be recognized as a separate nation. These Indians are still fighting for the rights accorded them under this treaty written 130 years ago. A delegation was sent to the San Francisco Conference to plead for their rights.

* * *

● One Canadian editor has been so deluged with poor poems that he finds he must re-write them before throwing them away.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marriage

. . . And evening, too, made beautiful with birds,
The singular and late, from tree to tree,
Where two are walking, now, with usual words,
With casual talk, or none, as it may be;
And the walk slow and aimless and not far
From windows looking at them down the lawn;
And overhead, and quietly, star by star,
In the green sky, the darkness coming on;

And airs grown cool with earth . . . and the slow turn
Of two who have no further way to go,
And so leave all the stars in heaven to burn
Behind them, moving in a light they know,
And close the door on what is theirs to keep,
And theirs alone, and climb the stairs to sleep.

DAVID MORTON

September Idyl

This is the orchard . . . this is where the trees,
Being weighted down with more than they could bear,
Let fall the pendant fruit and found their ease
In boughs relaxed and straightening in air.
The dim report, the intermittent sound
We heard for days and noticed not at all,
Was this late falling to the grassy ground
Of what the trees are willing, now, should fall.

But fruit is less a thing for thinking of
Than these that bore it for another's loot,
That gave themselves so wholly over to love:
Love's shining flower . . . and swollen branch . . . and fruit
For such as wish to gather in the sun,
While these have rest from love, his will being done.

DAVID MORTON

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theatre Arts

By John Gassner

● It is time, as the walrus didn't say, to speak of plays and music: Surprisingly little activity appeared on Broadway this summer, and nothing of importance can be reported. The one midsummer production, the musical comedy *Marinka*, was midsummer madness on the part of all collaborators except the tuneful, if somewhat old-fashioned, composer, Emmerich Kalman. An inept version of the Mayerling tragedy, with a happy ending, is the aptest summary, and it is only to be hoped that *Marinka* doesn't prove to be a prelude to further ineptitude, since at least fifteen musicals are being readied for the fall. This would be a pity indeed, as our recent theatre has made no greater strides than in music drama.

Over-earnest observers, like Harold Clurman, who has decried even *Oklahoma* as shallow theatre in his provocative book on the defunct but once important Group Theatre, *(The Fervent Years*, Alfred Knopf), may take exception. But it is well to realize that musicals may be affirmations rather than evasions, and even critical like *Pal Joey* rather than mere glorifications of accepted commonplaces. Musicals present the imagination with an ideal medium for fantasy. They offer occasions for the exercise of poetic talents otherwise confined to the unread portions of periodicals, as well as a field for scenic art that has long starved on the thin diet of one-set interiors; scenic designers have had good cause to complain that the theatre has reduced them to the role of interior decorators. That the modern ballet is inordinately indebted to the music drama is also evident. Incorporated with stage shows, the ballet has acquired a new functionalism, as well as a new public regard that may prove more stimulating than the applause of balletomanes. The artistry of a choreographer like Agnes deMille and of dancers like Sono Osato in *On the Town* and Bambi Linn in *Carousel* now reaches the average citizen rather than the cliques and claqueurs.

Finally, composers have found a medium that is as challenging and opportune as was opera in the last century. This is a special boon to those musicians who are not mere tunesmiths but are of the breed of Richard Rodgers and Leonard Bernstein. In *Carousel*, Richard Rodgers, for example, cast aside the better-than-average but never important style of his early work to confront the possibilities of American opera. He has not wholly solved the problem; neither did the late George Gershwin in the memorable *Porgy and Bess*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He has even sacrificed the occasion to write hit tunes, which he can turn out better than anyone else. As a result, *Carousel* is by no means the consistently tuneful show it could have been. It is something more important, an effort to integrate music and symbolic tragedy in the American idiom. *Carousel* lacks the sophisticated irony of *Liliom*, on which the libretto is based. It has lost the continental charm, and it has little of the guarded sentimentality combined with genteel cynicism given to *Liliom* by Ference Molnar, the Molie're of Budapest; *Carousel* sometimes even inclines toward Sunday school moralism. Rodgers' score, like Hammerstein's book and lyrics, reflects the sea-change. Nevertheless, it is a unique blend of vigor and tenderness, more evocative of the present day (though the scene is set in the past) than either smartness or sentimentality could make it. Notable, too, is the flattening or toning down of his orchestral colors. We could have brightness and brilliancy in the score, but it would have been less related to the background and characters of the Maine fishing village, less honest in fundamentals, and less effulgent with true pathos.

The case of Bernstein's score for *On the Town* is an even more striking example of the benefit music derives from the drama. Modernistic music has, indeed, always struck this reviewer as most acceptable when it is related to the theatre or its associated arts, and this has been so not merely in recent seasons. Lacking association with visual and dramatic events on a stage, program music has tended to be an emotional blur; it has sent the listener into a semi-coma in which, if images come to him at all, they are tantalizingly nebulous and contradictory. Some listeners may pretend to enjoy this experience, others do enjoy it. Yet they rarely have anything to hold on to, as they have in the classical symphonies, and the impressions are evanescent. Expressionistic music and other modern styles are often even more chaotic in their evocativeness. At any rate, the ear is gratifyingly abetted by the eyes in experiencing musical modernism. Stravinsky's *Fire-Bird* and *Sacre du Printemps* were written for the ballet, and they remain less satisfactory, less sustained and less interesting, as absolute music. I never fully enjoyed the last-mentioned piece until I saw the rites of spring enacted on the stage about a dozen years ago, when the great Philadelphia Orchestra joined forces with a competent ballet company.

The *On the Town* music has been aptly described by Harriet Johnson in *The New York Post*: "Leonard Bernstein's deft score has perky rhythms that constantly poke at your rhythm-bone in a likable way. The music, with its pungent harmonies, acts as an exhilarator which the three zany sailors and their zanier girl friends drink down and cough up again and again in devilish fashion. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deviltry keeps rocking on until the curtain." I doubt whether score alone would keep any sort of deviltry rollicking on until the finale. It is the extremely able fusion of the music and the stage action that prevents a rapid exhaustion of the effect. The origin of *On the Town*, both musically and in stage content, was Jerome Robbins' much-talked about brief ballet of three sailors in pursuit of a girl, *Fancy Free*, with a spare score by Bernstein. Fifteen minutes was the right length for this little masterpiece. For greater length in either department, especially the musical one, the musical comedy form alone could be satisfactory.

In short, our music drama has become the amalgam of the modern arts and is their greatest insurance against esotericism or mere exhaustion. There is no end to the resources of talent that it can muster at a moment's notice. The dancers, composers, musicians, scenic and costume directors who have been lying fallow in this fair land are legion. So are actors, with voices and without. Trained for playing Shakespeare? No. Trained for ensemble playing in the modern stage classics? Not more than a handful. But any number of them are more than able to acquit themselves in the broad style of the musicals. Is this necessarily an ignoble exertion while great problems knock at the gates with incessant clamor? That depends on the content and viewpoint. The girlie show by no means exhausts the potentialities today. The *Follies* and *Scandals* have vanished from Broadway. It is significant indeed that at this time, if we except the perennial ice-skating shows at the Rockefellers' Center Theatre, only one throwback to the giddy twenties, *Follow the Girls*, has been able to hold the boards this past season while the public flocks endlessly to the new kind of musical, which makes a bid for something less glandular: To *Oklahoma!*, which draws strength and beauty from the American soil and the men and women who have sprung up from it. (Incidentally, *Oklahoma!* has run through any number of cast changes without appreciable loss to either of its two companies, proving this reviewer's contention that talent for musicals is inexhaustible.) To *Carousel*, a dignified evocation of the half-blind searchings of the human heart, the misunderstandings and follies and the bitterness of frustration and isolation that comes to humanity's failures. There is, of course, *On the Town*, a robust metropolitan romance which captures the spirit of a city of inexhaustible sights and interests, with "glamor" and heartache and seedy reality jostling each other, as they do in this modern babel. Everything—the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the subways, the taxi, the Museum of Natural History, the Carnegie Hall rented studies, Times Square, the blatant night clubs and a Coney Island "cooch show," terrible in its disillusionment, — everything floats before us in the exuberant search for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pathetic working-girl, Miss Turnstiles. There is also that period comedy of feminism and abolitionism, *Bloomer Girl*, and something may be said too, for the *Dark of the Moon* Barbara Allen folk-tale; for the Grieg musical, *Song of Norway*, despite a dull book; and for the unsubtle *Up in Central Park* comedy of the Tweed Ring era, with its digs at municipal politics.

The trend is so strong that Hollywood has responded in its fashion. *Rhapsody in Blue*, Warner Brothers' successful Gershwin film, is one of the latest flicker exhibits. Poor in story, but rich in the Americana of Gershwin music, it indicates that even the celluloid moguls are abandoning the vulgar, hoary formulas, at least in "A pictures." Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer's vastly popular *Meet Me in St. Louis* is another straw in the wind, as is Columbia's Chopin film, *Song to Remember*, which will be followed by several other musical biographies.

Great stage or screen drama is unlikely to grow out of this movement. Great drama says itself in words that are at once thought and music. But civilized and satisfactory theatre can rise from the new dispensation for musicals, and has indeed already materialized. Let us hope that there is no retrogression, even if it would be idle to expect continuous progression.

* * *

Signs and Slogans of Our Times

"75% Eligible Bachelors. No Foreign Wives."
—Banner flung over side of ship bringing home the 886th Air Engineers Squadron

"Jeepers Creepers—Won't Somebody Be Our Keepers!"
—Ad in the San Quentin News appealing for men to serve as prison guards

"A young soldier with four and a half years of duty would like to meet a young widow with three children. Object: 85 points!"
—Ad in the Dunn, North Carolina Dispatch

"If you don't smell it, we ain't got it."
—Sign in a delicatessen store

"Wanted—High School boy for cigaret counter. No 'Yes-men' need apply."
—Sign in a Concord, N. H. drugstore window

"I have been a bad bird. Please keep me home, before I get killed."
—Note which an irate gardener attached to a neighbor's neighbor's chicken caught trespassing on his premises

* * *

● Brooms—good, old-fashioned corn-straw brooms with wood handles—are again sweeping the nation.
—National Geographic News Bulletin

* * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN BRIEF

By Jasper R. Lewis

PLANNING THE POSTWAR YEARS

It is a natural result of world ferment that those who have definite ideas of how to make the postwar world a better place, find this a fitting moment to divulge their aspirations. In *Time for Planning* (Harper's, $3.00), Lewis L. Lorwin expounds the advantages of national planning under a democratic social-economic system. The author was the leading spirit of the National Planning Association, and a former member of the Brookings Institute. Stated briefly, national planning means the end of selfish individualistic effort, in favor of group and collective formulation of policies for the general good. Dr. Lorwin reviews the growth of the idea from about 1919 to 1932, the economic developments of that period, and the efforts of some groups, particularly labor, to achieve a nation-wide system of planning. While he is strong for labor, he indicates that it, too, must "deepen its consciousness of its principles" and also "harmonize its short-run group-interests with the welfare of society as a whole." In years to come the masses, in all countries, will seek a larger share of the benefits of toil; intelligent planning for society as a whole will make for realization of this goal with he least economic friction. As the campaigns are carefully planned; it is worth considering the value of planning for peace.

With something of the same purpose, George B. de Huszar, Professor at the University of Chicago, offers *Practical Applications of Democracy* (Harper's, $2.00). His open-sesame is do-democracy; or, as he puts it, "democracy is something you do, not something you talk about." With the aid of diagrams and text he explains the advantages of cooperation in groups, between labor and management, between citizens and political leaders. His emphasis is on doing, rather than on theory. Whether it be in the field of schooling, industry or politics, active participation by the citizenry along intelligent lines is the only solution of dangers that threaten democracy in the years before us. There are many practical applications of his theory to the needs of everyday business, as well as some fresh ideas.

Apparently there is another school of thought which, recognizing the evils of the present form of democratic society, still adheres to the bases of our constitutional machinery, but proposes modifications and changes to gear it to our times. *Big Government: Can We Control It?* (Harper's, $2.50),

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

author points out, wars and war is the middle-of-the-road contribution of Merlo J. Pusey, of the editorial staff of *The Washington Post*. Pusey sees the federal government as the gargantua it has become. He cites examples of bad Congressional legislation, and of mistaken executive direction. However, he is not a worshiper of custom or Constitution. In this he is warmly applauded in the preface by Dr. Charles A. Beard, who openly condemns the high priests of the cult of Constitution-worshipers, "many of whom were lawyers for great corporations who, except on Sunday and ceremonial occasions, labored with might and main to use the Constitution as a shield for the protection of powerful clients against legislation for the general welfare." That might well show the general purport of the book, although Pusey is concerned with stupid maladministration more than with venal legislation. He believes "in the necessity of adjusting our historic charter to the requirements of the age in which we are living," and secondly that "the Constitution should continue to be a viable guarantee of our liberties, and that clearly entails consent of the people to major alterations." One might summarize by saying that the author admits government is a big wolf, but it need not be bad, and it can be controlled.

BOOK NOTES

Primarily intended as a militant expression of injustice done American Negroes, *Color and Democracy*, Colonies and Peace, by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois (Harcourt, Brace, $2.00), is a shrewd appraisal of the problems of race in world economics. Dr. Du Bois makes a fair resumé of colonial conditions under the big powers, in Africa and in Asia. He is a little less than fair to our own country, since the Philippine problem is hardly the same as that of India to the British, for instance. Any peace that leaves pre-war colonies in pre-war status, he is confident, will make future war. He apparently has much admiration for Russia, and hints that colored peoples, particularly those in colonies, may look to Russia for guidance, particularly if the other great powers fail to recognize changed conditions. Du Bois makes no threats, but he invites serious thinking by blunt recitation of the facts.

Ray F. Bergengren doesn't like capitalism or the private gain motive. In *I Speak for Joe Doakes* (Harper, $2.00), he discusses some of the problems in economics of the world's population, principally in the United States. He is of course, on solid ground when he pleads for service to humankind, rather than for selfish profit. As a worker in cooperative enterprises for twenty-five years his experience has shown him the advantage of mass effort. But I fail to see how Doakes is going to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

achieve this Paradise. The author still relies on the United States, Britain and Russia to keep order in the schoolroom, which means two—if not three—different ideas of man's place in the world.

Keep Your Head Down, by Walter Bernstein (Viking, $2.00), is a series of sketches of army life, nearly all of which have previously appeared in periodicals. That doesn't make them the less interesting. In fact, dated as each one is, from induction in April, 1941 to home-coming after a visit to Tito's headquarters early in 1944, they are progressively illuminating chapters on the war, entirely from the human interest side. Not overdrawn and neither critical nor ballyhoo, they form a continuous whole which portrays unvarnished and unglamorous the routine life of the infantryman. It is an excellent piece of work.

It is still in order, even though a bit belated, to call attention to one of the most graphically written books on war life, *American Guerilla in the Philippines,* by Ira Wolfert (Simon & Schuster, $2.75). It is the well-told story of Lt. I. D. Richardson, USNR, who managed to get around in some of the most exciting scrapes in the South Pacific, and the book is just as exciting.

The Far Shore by Max Miller, Lt. Commander USNR (Whittlesey House, $2.50), is the pen and picture story of the boys who spearheaded the invasions particularly in Normandy and the Mediterranean. It is written in the vein of calm observation rather than in the dramatic style of narrative, but the facts are there, all worth recording and reading.

Wartime Racketeers by Harry Lever and Joseph Young (Putnam, $2.75), recites some of the sucker games played by callous swindlers on servicemen and civilians during this big money era. Documented from the files of some Federal departments, it sounds very familiar. Your own face may be red—have you, too, bought some of the gasoline-stretching pills on the market?

Somewhat of an oddity is *No Voice Is Wholly Lost* by Harry Slochower (Creative Age, $3.75). From the writings of Huxley, Laurence, Steinbeck and others, and the thoughts of Neitzsche, Epengler, Santayana and Dewey, the author analyzes international culture in recent years. It is a book for the intellectual reader interested in social changes and progress.

Anyone with a yen for the Wild West will find pleasurable reading in *Pardner of the Wind* by Jack Thorp, as told to Neil McCullough Clark (Caxton, $4.00). Thorp was the cowboy who lived the exciting life described, and wrote in his own language his views on ranch life, hosses, cowpunchers' songs, etc. There's nothing tenderfoot about the telling; it is a natural picture of the life of the times of only a few generations back.

Twenty Careers of Tomorrow by Darrell and Frances Huff, (Whittlesey House, $2.50), is an attempt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to list and appraise the potentialities of some of the newer fields, such as plastics, electronics, television, radio, etc. The authors try to answer the questions which might be asked about the possibilities, and the book should be of help particularly to the ex-serviceman or woman considering a new start in life.

Samuel Hopkins Adams, from his intimate acquaintance with Woolcott, makes him something less than a superman in his biography, *A. Woolcott, His Life and His World* (Reynal & Hitchcock, $3.50). To the reader, Woolcott is shown as a vain, strutting, self-seeking publicity hound, his popularity seeming as much a fad as that of some radio commentators today. In fact, at times Hopkins makes one feel irritated enough to stick a pin somewhere in the balloon of his hero's ego. The story is for the most part fascinating, not so much because of Woolcott but because of the intimate portraits of other well-known figures in the printers' ink business.

Enrico Caruso, His Life and Death, by Dorothy Caruso, (Simon & Schuster, $2.75), is not the story of the famous tenor; it is a record of his wife's close observations of his character, likes and dislikes; it might have been subheaded "My Life With Caruso." With the aid of his letters, photographs and some of the original caricatures for which the great singer was also famous, the author has portrayed her husband as a very human being.

The first volume of what promises to be an annual and welcome visitor, *Best Film Plays of* 1943-1944 (Crown, $3.00), is under the painstaking editorship of our good neighbor overpage, John Gassner, and Dudley Nichols. The ten movies, presented in regular stage-play form, contain the editors' selection of the best, rather than the most popular. To many this presentation will have a dignity that is often missed on the screen, and at the very least it will serve as sound entertainment. John Gassner also discusses some of the failings and foibles of movie makers, and offers some sage comments on the plays which are included.

For a stimulant, *Private Purkey's Private Peace* by H. I. Phillips (Putnam, $2.00), will revive the spirit with some hearty laughs and some common sense hints on a private's ideas of a peace plan. Phillips apparently didn't spend too much time polishing his opus, but he gets the plain citizen's ideas across. Purkey's crashing of a private peace conference, where the experts threw him out, gives basis for the remark of the editor who was invited to listen to the burblings of one who had been in San Francisco. He declined, he said, to listen to the inside of the dope.

Recently I mentioned Mauldin's *Up Front*, but following the receipt of my copy in a certain camp near Le Havre, a better comment than mine comes to me, and I think Mauldin is entitled to know what his late conferees think: The Most Important GI writes me: "I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

don't know whether you liked the Mauldin book or not, but everyone here thinks it's damn good. Practically half the company has asked to read it. In fact, I haven't the slighest idea who has it at present."

Lurid, Wild West (of the nineties), wild girl and boy who goes wild—these are some of the ingredients of *That Girl from Memphis* by Wilbur Daniel Steele (Doubleday, Doran, $3.00). But don't discount it because of that. It makes light and "heart throb" reading, but it has a certain sincerity and natural background that lifts it above the common.

The world of make-believe is so bound in with today's realities that many—too many—of the recent volumes of fiction deal with the soldier and his troubles. Too many, because a distorted view is used for dramatic purposes. Take *The Brick Foxhole* by Richard Brooks (Harper's, $2.50). It is about the weekend furlough of a private who makes himself miserable by believing his wife has become unfaithful to him. The plot, with a murder in it, is excellently handled, the dialogues are General Issue, and the characters undoubtedly represent a part of the army. As a picture of the average soldier's life and reactions I think it is far from the truth, but drama need not mean truth. It is intense reading, provided you remember the world is not all black.

Interim by R. C. Hutchinson (Farrar & Rinehart, $2.00), is a brief study of the psychology of a war family and a casual visitor in uniform. The emphasis is on the unhappy side of war. Hutchinson uses his words carefully, makes a logical story, and leaves the reader with a profound sense of dislike of the world and its people.

New York in all its ugliness—the sensational aspect of the picture newspaper world—is shown in *Naked City*, by Weegee, (Essential Books, $4.00). Weegee's specialty is being at the point of action at the right moment, whether it be for a fire, a murder of a funeral. The photography is outstanding, and the book is definitely one side of New York. It is so realistic as to be unpleasant in spots.

* * *

SLIPS THAT PASS IN THE TYPE

● "Nothing gives a greater variety to the appearance of a house than a few undraped widows."

—*House and Garden*

A newspaper reported that in a collision between a train and a cow the engineer put on full speed, "dashed up against the cow and literally cut her into calves."

The New York Times recently reported the dither of Premier Voulgaris of Greece who could furnish no explanation for charges by Nicholas Zachariades, Communist party Secretary General that "Greece was planning to invade Albany." Neither could the *Times*, oh cursed spite, set it right, so who are we to try?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM: WHO SHALL CON SECURITY

The President?

By Mary Katharine Strong

● "Gentlemen may cry peace, peace — but there is no peace."

The American public, noting the speed with which the Senate passed the United Nations Charter, feels that the lie has been given to Patrick Henry. Men of good will are now prone to regard as won the battle for peace. The nascent World Security Organization is viewed as a machine which automatically insures universal tranquility. It is therefore pertinent to call to mind another passage of Patrick Henry's speech: "It is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren, 'til she transforms us into beasts."

Most commentators were surprised at the lack of senatorial opposition to the Charter. The truth of the matter is that those who oppose our extensive participation in international matters are saving their ammunition to strike the death blow when Congress debates the power of our delegate to the Security Council. They have seen what others overlook: without additional action, the organization will be nothing.

Senators Taft, Johnson, Wheeler, Shipstead and Langer forget that peace is more than the absence of hostilities, more than the product of an automatic machine. Its price, as with liberty, is eternal vigilance. Concrete actions are needed to serve not only as midwife but as governess.

The bitter Congressional battle will rage when the decisive question of the powers of the American delegate is debated. Is he to be responsible to Congress or to the President? More specifically, when there arises the problem of the use of the American military contingent, must our delegate secure the prior consent of Congress before he can vote in the Security Council for military sanctions, or can he do so upon the recommendations of the President?

To deny the responsibility of the delegate to the President is to deny the effectiveness of the Charter. The heart will have been dissected from the World Security Organization, and its carcass will be nothing more than a debating society. It is obvious that many of those in the Senate who approved our membership in the organization are anxious to lend a hand in removing its heart, thus making the end result so innocuous that it will be "perfectly safe" for this country to participate.

There are two sides to this all-important question. Is it constitutional for the American delegate, upon the approval of the President, to vote to use American

(Continued on page 86)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ɔL OUR DELEGATE TO THE ɔUNCIL?

Congress?

By Alice B. McGinty

● We conclude from the Senate debate on the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations that one need only cry "Constitution" to "let slip the dogs of war." Even that is unnecessary. Editorial writers are bombarding the public with syllogistic sleight-of-hand: "Every time a Senator, for partisan or other reason, voices a doubt about the Charter, additional doubts are stirred in this and other countries. Doubts and fears only breed wars." Proponents of the Charter have whipped themselves into a paroxysm of hysteria over the problem of legislation supplementary to Article 43 of the Charter which provides that an armed contingent be "on call" for the immediate use by our delegate to the Security Council. Senator Connally, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who has been seeing the blood spots of the slaughtered League before his eyes, has even advocated that the delegate be appointed without the "advice and consent of the Senate" as prescribed by Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution. He claims that "the delegate will be a diplomatic officer appointed by the President, and he will have to carry out the orders of the President. The President is the one who will decide how this nation votes on the Security Council." Rational discussion or even consideration of the constitutional problems involved in the position of the American delegate is thus almost totally eclipsed by administrative efforts to postpone even a discussion of the Congressional curbs provided by the Constitution.

We admire Mr. Connally's devotion to the cause of international peace. We sympathize with those Americans who, in the words of a recent *New York Times* editorial, are not concerned "about an abstraction called sovereignty" but about the welfare of their sons. We take our stand, however, with Senators Fullbright and Lucas, who claim that adoption of the Charter means a complete departure from our traditional policy in the field of international relations. We are gravely conscious of this responsibility and of the danger of being allied with the "foul play boys" who the administration claims are lying in ambush to cripple the Charter with the Congressional statute creating the office of the delegate. Come what may, we propose to consider the full implications of the position of our delegate to the Security Council in the calm light of the law and custom of the Constitution.

Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations leaves no doubt as to the powers of our delegate to the Security Council. Article 39 enables him to participate in determining the "existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression . . ." although it does not define what these shall be.

(Continued on page 91)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 84)

forces? Is it desirable? The answer to both questions is a resounding YES.

Far from being unconstitutional for the American representative to advocate the use of our forces without the consent of Congress, it would be unconstitutional if it were necessary that Congress approve each use of the American contingent.

Articles of two fundamental documents should be kept in mind. Article 43 of the San Francisco Charter says:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.
2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of force, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

We turn now to the American Constitution, Article VI:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; *and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land . . .*

On one side, therefore, is the Charter of the United Nations. It has been ratified by the Senate and is thus to be viewed as any other treaty. In this treaty is the provision that all members are to make available armed forces to the Security Council. The agreements to be concluded later do not center around whether or not we will contribute forces; that was decided already when we ratified the Charter. Our Constitution says that treaties are part of the supreme law of the land, and the Supreme Court has re-enforced this provision many times *(Holland vs. Missouri)*. This country, having approved the treaty, is committed to furnish armed forces upon the call of the Security Council.

Another constitutional provision is applicable. "He (the President) shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (Article II, section 3). The ratification of the Charter makes it a law of the land; the Charter obligates this country to supply forces and the President is responsible for seeing that the laws be faithfully executed. This is not merely a sophisticated syllogism; the Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that the President has both the duty and the right to utilize his powers as head of the Executive Department and as Commander in Chief to carry out the laws *(In re Neagle, U. S. vs. Curtis-Wright Corp.)*. It has ruled that the "laws" include rules of general international law *(The Paquete Habana)* and agreements binding the United States *(U. S. vs. Belmont)*, as well as treaties and acts of Congress. As Senator Connally, a delegate at the San Francisco Conference and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, tersely stated the case in arguing for the Presidential responsibility of the American representative: "It is the duty of the President to enforce the law, and a treaty ratified by this Senate is the law of this country."

But what, asks the anxious citizen, becomes of Congress's constitutional power to declare war? In reality, however, the President now is given no more power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than he has always had. It has been a long established constitutional principle that the President, as Commander in Chief, may use our armed forces when he deems it necessary to protect American citizens abroad, to defend American property, or to protect our inchoate interests. This country is apt to forget the numerous occasions when our military forces have been used abroad without Congressional approval. Our good neighbors to the South, sometimes to our discomfort, remember but too well chapter and verse of our actions. There have been many interpositions in Mexico, Haiti and Nicaragua. President Polk, to force the issue with Mexico in 1845, ordered American troops to station themselves on territory which Mexico rightly considered hers, and when Mexican troops disputed our position, Polk successfully sought a Congressional declaration of war.

President Grant in 1870 sent a strong naval force to Santo Domingo to force its president to negotiate a treaty of annexation with the United States, and kept the force there even after our Senate had rejected the treaty. Since 1912 Santo Domingo was honored with at least one visit a year by United States cruisers; and in 1916 a military occupation was established which lasted until 1924. President Roosevelt's action in 1903 in preventing Colombian intervention in the Panama revolution was based on an inchoate interest of this country. The Supreme Court upheld President Pierce when the Navy in 1854 bombarded San Juan in Nicaragua until the town was in ashes, in default of reparation demanded for an attack on an American consul. President Wilson ordered a force of sailors and marines in 1914 to capture Vera Cruz to repay Huerta for his affront to the American flag.

There was the use of force in the Boxer episode of 1900. There has been intervention from the jungles of the Philippines to the shores of Tripoli. Three months before he summoned Congress for a special session, President Lincoln issued a call for 75,000 volunteers and proclaimed a blockade of the Southern ports. Though this was done prior to a Congressional declaration of war, the Supreme Court upheld the Chief Executive *(The Prize Cases)*. Thus, any Congressional reservation that the President must secure the consent of Congress before he can place the American contingent at the disposal of the Security Council would clearly be an infringement of his constitutional rights as Commander in Chief.

As Senator Vandenberg stated the issue:

"I think that if we were to require the consent of Congress on every use of our armed forces, it would not only violate the spirit of the Charter, but it would violate the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, because under the Constitution the President has certain rights to use our armed forces in the national defense without consulting Congress. It has been done 72 times within the last 150 years. It is just as much a part of the Constitution as is the Congressional right to declare war. Very clearly for 150 years the President has had the right to use our armed forces in a preliminary way for the national defense and the interest of preventing war. This is a complete analogy to the intended use of preliminary force by the Security Council."

Some may wonder what is left of Congress's right to declare war. In the modern sense of war on a world-wide level, nothing has been detracted from this important power. *The New York Times* in an editorial on July 18 puts the matter thus:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"There can still be no declaration of war without the approval of Congress. There can still be no sinews of war and no mobilization of military force beyond an agreed-upon contingent without Congressional approval. But there can be, and should be, a minimum United Nations' strength, mobilized with our approval."

In other words, it remains with Congress to set into motion the vast machinery, the nation's industrial potential, many special wartime powers of the President, the mobilization of the entire nation behind a modern war. The President, as Commander-in-Chief, has the authority both under the Constitution and under standing legislation to use the existing armed force in the interests of the United States.

Those who fear that the President, through our delegate at the Security Council, can embroil us in a gigantic World War III would do well to read Article 27 of the Charter of the United Nations:

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.
3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members (The Big Five); . . . .

It is obvious that no major power will vote for the use of armed force against itself. It is equally plain that there can be no large-scale war which does not involve any of the Big Five. If one of these nations becomes an aggressor, international police action of the kind contemplated by the Charter will not come into play. The Security Council will vote for the use of force only in dealing with those minor disturbances with respect to which the Big Five can agree upon a common policy. If World War III comes, it will be only by action of the large nations acting *outside* the Security Council.

With all the members of the World Security Organization contributing forces, the number of troops donated by any one nation to the general pool would be extremely small. Certainly the Presidential power to instruct the American delegate upon the use of our share of the forces, which will no doubt be smaller in number than our regular standing army, cannot involve this country in another major war. As *The Chicago Daily News* says: "The fact is that the use of force on a large scale by order of the Security Council is a remote possibility. . . . (No action) is in fact likely for a long time to exceed the scope of punitive expeditions we have made in the past with less justification than the authority of the United Nations would give."

Thus far in discussing the constitutional issue we have dealt solely with the military aspect of the problem. If it can be solved satisfactorily, the lesser powers which the delegate has can be disposed of by the same line of reasoning. The President is the accepted organ of our foreign policy *(U. S. vs. Curtis-Wright Corp.)*. This office has the necessary facilities for secrecy, speed and information which Congress lacks. Who was it who formulated the Monroe Doctrine, the Open Door policy, the Good Neighbor concept? Who controls our diplomatic representatives? If one doubts the President's authority in foreign economic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters, let him look at the reciprocal trade agreements program and the powers entrusted to the American delegate at the Bretton Woods organization? Our delegate to the Security Council will have the same relation to the Chief Executive as do all other diplomatic officers. To make our delegate responsible to Congress while our ministers and ambassadors are responsible to the President would be nothing less than a mockery of our constitutional organization of powers. In effect, two foreign policies would be followed—one by the Chief Executive, one by Congress.

From the above arguments, it is clear that the Constitution and American history require that the American delegate be responsible to the President. But is it advisable that this be so? If international conflicts are to be alleviated, it is necessary that the Security Council act with all possible speed. It is not hard to vision what would happen if international action had to wait for the Senate to approve action. Filibustering is still an American tradition, and Congress is not in continuous session throughout the year. Unless the World Security Organization creates confidence that any aggression will be confronted immediately by force able to block its success, it will lack real effect. A potential aggressor will tend to assume the risk if he knows that sanctions will be uncertain and slow.

Decisive action does not have the character of a legal sanction unless it operates instantaneously upon the occurrence of a crime. It is the lack of definite sanctions against law-breaking that makes international law weak and the community of nations a frequent victim of violence. Society tends towards anarchy if the police are free to debate upon the type of action to be taken in an emergency, or if they may deliberate upon the expediency of taking action at all.

Senator Wagner, in arguing that the American delegate be empowered, on the order of the President, to commit a predetermined contingent of our forces for use in restraining aggression, cogently stated the argument thus:

> "I believe that it is crucial to the success of the enterprise that he have this power. It is crucial because of the very fact that the democratic nations are also peace-loving nations. They are not ready to declare war on slight provocation. They move only when it is manifest that there is no course other than war. They act only when the danger is clear, imminent and overwhelming. But by that time the little aggression has become a major aggression; the conflict has become a great war. What might have been prevented by prompt show of force must be undone at the price of wholesale slaughter."

Some view the new organization as nothing more than domination by power politics of the small nations by the Big Five. Granted that the United Nations Charter is not a perfect instrument, it is the best that could possibly be agreed upon by fifty nations. It is the best that could secure the almost unanimous consent of the Senate. Those who regret that checks are not available against Great Britain, Russia, France or China should remember that this country would have a hard time swallowing checks upon the sovereign power of the United States. The Charter is only the beginning, but to weaken it because it is not perfect is to deny the existence of a better organization through evolution. Had the imperfect Articles of Confederation been rejected, the Constitution probably would never have come into existence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Opponents are quick to point out that under the Charter this country might side with the other big nations in their imperialistic designs upon small states. They claim that there is a greater likelihood of this happening if the President alone can instruct our delegate than if Congress debates the issue. Three factors should be mentioned in this connection. In the first place action by the Security Council can only take place by the vote of *seven* nations, including all the Big Five. This means that two of the smaller nations must also agree before armed forces can be used. It is difficult to imagine the smaller nations blindly falling in with the designs of the powerful nations. Secondly, it is equally improbable that all of the Big Five could agree to support the imperialistic plans of any one major power. There is hardly a spot on the globe where the interests of the large nations are not in conflict. It is therefore highly unlikely that the Big Five would unanimously vote to further the nefarious schemes of any one of its members.

Most important, however, would be the situation in this country. It can seriously be questioned whether any American President could support bald designs of conquest by other nations without bringing a wave of public repudiation upon his head. Few men would dare undertake such a venture. But suppose a future President were disposed to use the American contingent in conjunction with the rest of the Big Five acting within the Security Council to further the private ends of, let us say, China. Those who argue for Congressional control of the American delegate maintain that Congress would be less likely than the President to allow our armed forces to be a party to such a plan, and the "nay" vote of the American delegate would prevent the Security Council from acting. But a future President, if he contemplates the foul deeds considered by some, would not be hindered by making the American delegate responsible to Congress. He could very easily order a naval squadron to place itself strategically in Asiatic waters to lend "moral" support to China, and, if it were conveniently discovered that American interests were involved, a landing by marines would not be improbable. Here would be a perfect example of two competing foreign policies followed by this country. It would be the inevitable result of separating the President's control of the American contingent to the Security Council from his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief.

The new World Security Organization is not a panacea for international turmoil. But the first step toward our goal was taken when the Senate ratified the Charter. The ratification, however, does not mean a job finished, but merely a difficult task begun. The crossroads will appear when the powers of our delegate are decided. One turn will lead to certain disaster by crippling the new organization; the other can, if given the sweat and toil of all nations, lead to peace. The dream of perpetual peace may not come true, but everything should be done to work toward that end. Only by granting the President his rightful authority can the attempt succeed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 85)

Article 41 enables him to participate in deciding what measures short of war such as partial or complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations' will be used. Should these prove inadequate, Article 42 provides that the Security Council may "take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." Article 43 has become the bone of Senatorial contention:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.
2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.
3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Article 45 states "Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee."

In the light of this enumeration of powers, we agree with Senator Connally that ratification of the Charter by the United States Senate means that we accept the full responsibilities entailed by these powers. We do not agree, however, that ratification of the Charter by the United States Senate means that the delegate, whether he have the status of a President, Secretary of State or diplomatic representative, has a *carte blanche* to use these powers at will without the advice and consent of Congress. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution explicitly provides that the Congress shall have the power to:

Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations;

Define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

Declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

Raise and support Armies;

Make Rules for the Government and Regulations of the land and naval forces;

Provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States;

Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

Note that Article 43 of the Charter provides that the use of armed forces shall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be made in accordance with "a special agreement or agreements to be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes" and that Article 45, providing for the immediate use of national air-force, says that the "strength and degree of readiness" of these forces "shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43."

It may be well to reflect upon our own "constitutional process." The laws of the Constitution provides in Article II, Section 2, that the President shall have "Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur;'. The custom of the Constitution may be construed from the following incidents in which Congress ruled in 1796 and again in 1871 that "When a treaty stipulates regulations on any of the subjects submitted by the Constitution to the power of Congress, it must depend for its execution as to such stipulations on a law or laws to be passed by Congress; and it is in the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives in all such cases to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying such treaty into effect and to determine and act thereon, as in their judgment may be most conducive to the public good." "A treaty or any other international obligation is valid only when the consent of the state is tacitly or expressly given, and to determine the reality of consent of the constitutional law of the state must be appealed to. Only the organs there designated each within its constitutional competence can bind the nation." The treaty power may not deprive the organs of the government of any of the powers inherent or delegated by the Constitution. As the question of the validity of the Charter as a treaty has not been raised in the Senate hearings, we may assume that the framers intended that it would be passed in accordance with our constitutional law and custom. It is clear that if the delegate to the Security Council is to exercise the powers enumerated in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, then he must be subject to the control of Congress as the control of the powers he is to exercise has been given by the Constitution to Congress.

Charter enthusiasts plead that the Charter does not define the powers to be given by each nation to its delegate on the Security Council. We agree it is strictly an American problem. The Constitution of the United States is based on the principle of the separation of powers. As Herbert Hoover pointed out, the parliamentary systems of Britain and France which are not based on the principle of the separation of powers, are assured that the vote of their Security Council representative will be the vote of their legislative arm. The vote of the Russian delegate will be determined by a totalitarian government in Moscow. This fact, however, does not absolve us of the responsibility of finding a way out of our dilemma nor does it mean we can wishfully pretend that such a problem does not exist.

Senator Connally's position may be summed up as follows: It is the President's duty to execute the laws. The Charter by adoption becomes a treaty i.e. a law, therefore the President already has the power to execute all the provisions contained in Chapter VII of the Treaty. This view is held by many advocates of the Charter who further maintain that any Congressional limitations of the delegate's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power would not only violate the spirit of the Charter but also the Constitution of the United States! This position is based on Article II, Section 1. of the Constitution which states that "the Executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America;", and in Supreme Court decisions such as in re Neagle, 135 U. S. 1,64 C1890, which interpreted the President's commission to execute the laws liberally. However, as pointed out by such constitutional authorities as Willoughby and Wright, the decision in the Neagle case is justified only in exceptional circumstances. Article I indicates the obligation of the President to execute the law but does not confer any powers *per se*. "It is an obligation which is to be fulfilled by the exercise of those powers which the Constitution and Congress have seen fit to confer. It does not mean that he can supply means not provided by law or take measures not within the scope of his delegated powers, however appropriate they might be for the meeting of international responsibilities."

It cannot be denied that Marshall's dictum that the President is the sole organ of the nation in its external relations has been reinforced by the decision in the U. S. vs. Curtiss-Wright Corp. 299 U. S. 304,318 (1936) case: That for the purposes of international "negotiation and inquiry" states "must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from . . . restriction which would not be admissable were domestic affairs alone involved." Note that the President's powers are limited to "negotiations and inquiry" and that they be exercised "in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution." The President's role is that of an agent and as such he cannot bind his principal, the nation, in fundamental matters such as those entailed in the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter unless he has been explicitly authorized to do so.

There yet remains the dilemma of the internationalists which Connally-Vandenberg Steamroller, Inc., tend to distort to their own ends. We are in sympathetic accord with those liberals who, anxious to end the spectre of international anarchy, support the Charter. We are for the Charter. Our support of the Charter, however, does not blind us to its imperfections, nor does consciousness of its imperfections mean that we disavow it as the first faltering step in the direction of organized effort to bring order out of international anarchy. Mr. Connally and Mr. Vandenberg to the contrary, we feel free to raise a legitimate objection. The Charter, by no means guarantees international peace. It is not in reality based on "the sovereign equality of all of its Members" as stated in Article 2, Section I. The veto power of the Big Five vitiates this pretension. Contrary to high pressure sales talk, what the Charter does preserve is the alliance between the great powers, Britain, Russia, the United States, France, and China. It preserves them against a voice, or rather a gun, being raised at any time against any possible imperialistic design they may choose to execute. Although the great powers are not thought, in some quarters, to have imperialistic designs at the moment, it is within the realm of possibility. Let us consider a hypothetical case just barely within this realm. Suppose that Korea had been guaranteed its independence unconditionally when it had been freed of Japanese domination. However, before it could be effected,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

let us suppose that China sent in troops to forestall Korea's "independence day," Korea appeals to the United Nations Organiation. China is one of the Big Five. She could veto any action that the Security Council may wish to take in support of Korea. If, on the other hand, the United States, for "raison d'etat," could be persuaded to support China, a delegate, responsible only to the President, could commit the United States to this policy regardless of the pressure of liberal opinion at home. The delegate would be using the armed contingent of the United States to support a large nation against a helpless one. We would be furthering China's imperial resign at the loss of democratic principle! Anyone who believes this to be the rant of a last ditch perfectionist need only look nearer home for startling parellels to this hypothetical situation. The Charter itself which sets up a league of soveregn states is an admission that, at this stage in world history, we are unable to abandon our present concepts of nationalism and sovereignty or even attempt a definition of aggression in the simple terms of the Act of Chapultepec. Dare we suggest it therefore follows that we are prepared to take the consequences of such reluctance? If we are not ready to abandon these concepts, are we ready to abandon the historical safeguards placed on the use of the President's power?

The test of democracy is its ability to maintain its representative institutions in a crisis. If the restrictions on the President's powers provided for by the separation of powers in the Constitution is disregarded, how can we prevent a presidential dictatorship? The history of dictatorships shows that even a constitutional provision for dictatorial powers in the time of a national emergency (Weimar Constitution, Article 48, Paragraph 54) may be used as the stepping stone for a later dictatorship. The danger that powers first used for war purposes may later be revived and rationalized under peacetime conditions is acute. The executive powers of both the dictatorships and the democracies were expended during the economic and political crises of the past fifteen years. The democracies were able to maintain the democratic processes by keeping the representative principle. While the President does need a large area of flexibility to meet the obligations of his office, we have to depend on the President's personal view of the limitations of his power. Discretion in use of force by legislative bodies is second only to legislative control of the purse in the historical struggle for controlling abritrary power. As it is, a President may well lead us to the brink of war without even consulting Congress. President Roosevelt secured naval bases for the United States in exchange for overage destroyers without Senatorial consent. He placed the United States on the side of democracies in this war and promised them material aid. After our entry into the war, he pledged the United States to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and made the United States a signatory to the United Nation's pact all without the consent or knowledge of Congress. A delegate to the Security Council responsible only to the President could commit us to policies without our knowledge and against which we could do nothing. That second great but unofficial organ of democracy, public opinion, would thus be robbed of its essential function. Under such circumstances we could only make a pretense at retaining the representative principle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As dangerous as such practices are constitutionally, they have a damaging psychological effect upon the relation of President and Congress. The "strong" Presidents, Lincoln, Wilson, and the two Roosevelts have inspired obstructionist tactics on the part of Congress. A tactful relationship of mutual help in crises is more productive for the welfare of the nation. Senators Vandenberg and Connally who are leading the fight in the Senate for the ratification of the Charter must certainly be aware that their help was solicited in the drafting of the Charter for this very reason.

Let it be clearly understood that we are not opposed to the Charter. We are opposed to hysterical attempts to railroad it through Congress with the supplementary legislation required by Article 43 and deprived of the Congressional sanctions accorded that body by the Constitution of the United States and clearly implied by the Charter itself. Such a course would make it impossible to break any arbitrary assertion of the power by the President. We would be faced by the ridiculous paradox of attempting to curb irresponsible power in the foreign field while giving it free rein in the domestic.

REFERENCES

Books:

Corwin, E. S. *The Use of Presidential Power*
Corwin, E. S. *The President's Control of Foreign Relations*
Berdahl, C. A. *War Powers of the Executive in the United States*
Koenig, L. W. *The Presidency and the Crisis*
Milton, G. F. *The Use of Presidential Power*
Swisher, C. B. *American Constitutional Development*
Wright, Q. *Control of American Foreign Relations*

Documents:

Constitution of the United States
Charter of the United Nations, State Department Bulletin, June 24, 1945

Supreme Court Decisions:

The Prize Cases, 2 Black 635 (1863)
In re Neagle, 135 U. S. 1, 64 (1890)
U. S. vs. Curtis-Wright Corp, 299 U. S. 304, 318 (1936)
Missouri vs Holland, 252 U. S. 416 (1920)
The Paquete Habana, 175 U S. 677 (1899)
U. S. vs. Belmont, 301 U. S. 203, 220 (1936)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Listening In

By H. C. L. Jackson
From his column in The Detroit News

● No stranger to governmental forms is Major L. W. Carmichael, officer in charge of recruiting for the Marine Corps in Detroit.

Which is one reason why a grimmish grin he grun a few days after the recent birth of his son, Stephen Webb Carmichael.

The food situation being what it is, the Major promptly appeared (when Son Stephen was one week old) before his ration board and filled out a form for a No. 4 ration book.

On this he carefully noted that Stephen was one week old.

July 28, came back the form with the command that "Stephen Webb Carmichael will appear in person before this board to inform it if he is eating in a government organized mess."

Which, on second thought, could be the basis of considerable argument . . .

★ ★ ★

● While it's true that Willow Run isn't running high, wide and rambunctious as it did in the days of the not-so-distant yore, there still are plenty of employees—mostly in office crews who are tenderly wrapping up the loose ends with red tape.

That some of the Willow Runners are not enjoying the snail's pace of the present we're assured by Jarell, who cites the case of a young woman who yawned:

"I certainly do hope we get finished here pretty soon, because I notice that every day, now, I'm getting to look more like the picture on my badge."

★ ★ ★

● Red gave a lift to a paratrooper he saw hobbling, with a cane along the street.

The paratrooper turned out to be very much a veteran. He wore numerous battle stars picked up in North Africa and Europe.

Nor was he averse to answering questions.

He said he had been shot at by his own artillery; bombed by his own bombers; dropped from too high altitudes for safe landings under enemy fire at Sicily, Anzio and in Southern France.

"Where did you get wounded?" Red pried.

The paratrooper, who'd been telling his tale of mishaps, not as a whiner, but in a tone as impersonal as a bullet, answered:

"That was in France. I stepped on a German mine in a supposedly cleared field and blew most of my right foot off."

The soldier went silent. Red felt impelled to say something. So he remarked:

"Well, I hope your string of hard luck ended when you got home."

"When I got home," observed the paratrooper, "I found my wife had eloped with a civilian."

Copyright 1945, by The Detroit News, Detroit, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—continued from other side

it, no more than the publisher's retail price, and frequently much less. (A small charge is added to cover postage and other mailing expenses.)

As a member you receive a careful pre-publication report about each book-of-the-month (and at the same time reports about all other important new books). If you want the book-of-the-month, you let it come. If not, you specify some other book you want, or simply write, "Send me nothing." With every two books-of-the-month you bu you receive, free, a book dividend. *T and Stop Me* is an example. Last ye the retail value of books given to Clu members was over $9,000,000.

Your only obligation as a member is buy no fewer than four books-of-th month in any twelve-month period, an you can cancel your subscription any tim after doing so. (Prices are slightly high in Canada.)

and receive a **FREE** *copy—as a new member—of*

TRY AND STOP ME

By BENNETT CERF

A collection of anecdotes and stories, mostly humorous

illustrated by CARL ROSE

TEAR OFF AND MAIL THIS POSTCARD

•

NO STAMP NEEDED

•

SEE OTHER SIDE

BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB A10

385 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Please enroll me as a member. I am to receive a free copy of TRY AND STOP ME, and for every two books-of-the-month I purchase from the Club I am to receive, free, the current book-dividend then being distributed. I agree to purchase at least four books-of-the-month from the Club each full year I am a member, and I may cancel my subscription any time after purchasing four such books from the Club.

Name----------

Please Print Plainly

Address----------

City---------- Postal District No. (if any) ---------- *State*----------

☐ **IMPORTANT:** Please check here if you do NOT want us to begin your subscription with the current double-selection, *Up Front* and *The World, The Flesh and Father Smith.* The price of the two books, to members only, is $3.00.

Book prices are slightly higher in Canada but the Club ships to Canadian members, without any extra charge for duty, through Book-of-the-Month Club (Canada), Ltd.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Begin your subscription to the BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB

with this remarkable Double selection

COMBINED PRICE TO MEMBERS $3.00

UP FRONT

By Bill Mauldin

BILL MAULDIN

and

THE WORLD, THE FLESH AND FATHER SMITH

By Bruce Marshall

BRUCE MARSHALL

TO JOIN THE BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB

SIGNING and mailing the coupon enrolls you. You pay no fixed sum as a member and obligate yourself for no fixed term. *You pay for each book as you receive* —continued on other side

FIRST CLASS
Permit No. 419
(Sec. 510 PL&R)
New York, N. Y.

BUSINESS REPLY CARD
(No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed in the United States)

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY

BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB, INC.

385 MADISON AVENUE

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FREE

TO NEW MEMBERS

TRY AN

STOP M

By Bennett C

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED